The Forum

JUNE, 1900.

THE ATTITUDE OF THE UNITED STATES TOWARDS THE CHINESE.

THE attitude which the United States has just assumed in reference to the action of European powers claiming spheres of interest in China is unquestionably the most important diplomatic event in the affairs of the Chinese Empire since the treaty of Nankin, in which the first five ports of the country to be thrown open to foreign trade were formally specified. In acquiring territory in China, the desire of European nations generally has not been to secure people to govern so much as to attain for themselves special and exclusive privileges of trade. In such enterprises each Power has endeavored to obtain, in a given region, the right to enter free the goods of her own citizens while taxing the importations of every other nation.

Of the nations against whom tariffs have to be erected, in operating such a system, the United States stands in the first rank. By reason of her tremendous and highly wrought industrial power she can undersell any other nation in many, if not in most, commercial products in any market to which she has access. Save for the tariffs of France, Russia, and Germany, the United States could supply those countries with many articles which they consume, to the detriment of native producers, just as in London English manufacturers are now undersold by their American compeers. Any sphere of influence in which the United States should have trading rights equal to those of the nation in possession would be a useless sphere. Practically, it

Copyright, 1899, by The Forum Publishing Company.
Permission to republish articles is reserved.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

would belong, not only to the European nation nominally possessing it, but also to the United States.

No unusual perceptive powers are required to see that if the United States secures equal trading rights in all spheres of influence an end will be put to that particular line of European policy in the Far East. This is exactly the object for which all intelligent and patriotic Chinese have striven ; but the end has arrived before it was expected. They deemed that the United States, when confronted with possible action in this respect, would consider that her interests in the Far East were not yet sufficiently advanced to admit of interference which might possibly have to be sustained by warlike demonstrations. These interests, of course, would never be other than those of trade ; and it was felt that great effort should be made to awaken in American manufacturers and producers an interest in the markets which the Orient presents, and to bring to their notice the enormous demand in the East for articles of American production. It has been the special aim of Mr. Wu Ting-fang, the Chinese minister at Washington, to induce all legitimate American enterprises to take part in the industrial development of China ; and the Consulate-General, working with the whole body of Chinese Consuls in the United States, has been unceasing in its endeavors, through every channel promising success, to make shippers realize the conditions of trade in the East, and to give them a knowledge of the opportunities open there.

The present Administration, however, has grasped the Eastern Question, and has fully appreciated the status of the United States in relation to it. It realizes, too, that of all the nations of the earth, the United States has the most promising future in China, and that her interests are indissolubly bound up with the preservation of China's government and the integrity of the Empire.

This awakening of the States to the existence of China as a field for commercial enterprise is most comforting to the Chinese people. To the achievement of Admiral Dewey at Manila Bay is to be credited the attention which the Orient has aroused in the minds of the most restless and progressive people in the world. So long as China was 10,000 miles away from the back-door of the nation, what happened to, and within, her was of little more concern to the average American than a disturbance of corresponding moment in the solar heavens ; but when United States merchants realized that Hong Kong and Canton were nearer than any other foreign ports to an American possession, then the Empire, of which Canton is a part, and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Hong Kong a port of entry, grew to be of as much interest to Americans as any other trading country.

Taking advantage of this, the Chinese officials resident in the United States have done what they could to make China understood and discussed ; and in this work an immense amount of aid has been rendered by such institutions as the International Commercial Museum and Export Association of Philadelphia, the California Board of Trade, the Chamber of Commerce, and the Manufacturers' and Producers' Association of San Francisco. The writer is in a position to see some of the effects of this agitation. Though Consul-General for China for three years, until the fight at Manila not a dozen persons called upon him with plans for going to China in commercial ventures. But since May, 1898, there have been over 100 such visitors, representing many of the largest manufacturing concerns of the East and the West. When the exports and imports between the United States and China are footed up for 1899, the totals will prove a veritable surprise. From computations to date the figures indicate that the imports will exceed $22,000,000, an advance of $3,000,000 since 1894, and that the exports will be over $12,000,000, an advance of $6,000,000 since the same year.

These results are gratifying ; yet the totals are a bagatelle to what they should be when we consider that China contains over 400,000,000 of sober, earnest, practical, and industrious people, producers and traders by instinct, and anxious to possess the goods and implements of the West.

The policy of the Administration at Washington will do much to popularize the United States in China, especially amongst the trading classes at the Free Ports. But there are yet some dark spots on the disk of trade, and these need to be burnished off by vigorous rubbing. The best cleansing powder is better knowledge of the Chinese people and wider trade relations with them. The spots to which I refer are the laws of this nation toward Chinese immigrants. The laws of the United States prohibiting Chinese immigration are without parallel in the codes of the world, and can only be compared to the regulations of the Chinese nation itself in a period of its history to which we would under no consideration revert.

Moreover, in addition to its inherent injustice, the statute is based on a misconception of conditions and a mistake in facts. It had its origin with the rabble. Its promoters were speakers from the tops of soap-boxes and the tail-skids of drays. It was caught up by politi-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cians when the clamor had gathered strength with the mob, and when appearances indicated that the latter could poll votes enough to elect its ringleaders to office. Whenever a calm and dispassionate inquiry into the conditions was held the verdict was sure to be in favor of the Chinese ; and it was on this account that the friends of justice in Congress held out so long against the demands upon that body for measures of exclusion.

Nevertheless, the situation here as regards the Chinese was remarkable, and in the nature of things could not occur again. The Chinese were brought here to grade and build the Central Pacific Railroad. A thousand miles of railroad had to be laid across deserts and over mountains—perhaps the most difficult feat of railway construction which, up to that time, had been attempted in the United States. The road was to be built, too, in a part of the continent that was practically without inhabitants, and, therefore, in advance of settlement. White workmen could not be had. Three thousand miles yawned between the reservoirs of population, and the journey was tedious and slow; so the building of the railroad had to be pushed at once. Ten thousand men were needed, and rake and scrape as the builders would, only 800 whites could be gathered to engage in the work.

In this exigency the experiment with Chinese laborers was tried. At first it was thought that they would prove inefficient—that they were too light of body to stand the heavy work ; that they could not endure the fatigues of the occupation. A few were put on the lightest part of the work, and since these proved their ability to perform well all they were set to do, the experiment was extended, and before long Chinese were doing all the unskilled labor which the work required. They received but thirty-one dollars per month and boarded themselves, while the whites were paid forty-five dollars per month and found. Yet, according to the testimony of James Strobridge, superintendent of construction, and Charles Crocker, one of the five proprietors of the road, who had charge of the construction, the Chinese were more reliable and more efficient laborers than the whites. They could excel the whites in any branch of the work, whether light shovelling or the heaviest rock-drilling ; and a body of Chinese even excelled in results an equal number of picked Cornish miners who were set to drill one end of a tunnel through a mountain. The Chinese were put upon the other end, and the two gangs started from a shaft at the centre.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In order to supply the thousands of Chinese required for this great work the coolie ships were kept running to and from China, bringing their loads of immigrants from Kwang-tung province. There was no trouble concerning the Chinese so long as the road was building. Hittell's "History of California" recites how the white laborers and the "China Boys" marched together in parade, and how the former made speeches to the latter, extending their hands in comradeship.

Suddenly, however, the road was finished; and this army of 15,000 laborers was idle and at large. In a strange land, among a strange people, with no capital but their ability and willingness to work, they flocked to San Francisco. Here they swarmed upon the streets, and, conspicuous from their racial characteristics, gave the impression that there was an immensely larger number of them in the district.

The industries of the city and of the adjacent parts of the State could not at once absorb so large a number of workers without displacing many of those who already held jobs; but the Chinese had to live; and the question being distinctly one of wages, they could, if forced, live on very little. Their reputation as superior workers to the whites had been established by their employment on the railroad; and so on every hand were found employers who discharged their white employees and put Chinese at lower wages in the vacancies thus made.

Added to all this, the steamships kept coming in from China bearing still larger loads of coolies, who had embarked under the belief that their services were required in building the road, and who, when they arrived, found the employment market as tightly shut as the door of Ali Baba's cave. At the same time there came thousands of white laborers, immigrants borne overland by the newly running trains, each with the belief that jobs were to be had in plenty in California, and that wages were high. These found on their arrival that most of the work was being done by Chinese, who were giving satisfaction, thereby closing the doors against the whites. Of course, such a condition could not last long without an agitation on the part of the white unemployed. The conditions admitted of the manufacture of political capital. Among the idle there were many who were ready and able to step forward and avail themselves of the opportunity.

The results of this agitation we know. On the Pacific Coast there were men strong in character, of independent natures, and with a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

keen sense of justice—men like Col. F. A. Bee, and George F. Seward, once United States minister to China—who knew the Chinese people and who fought the agitation with all their eloquence and power; but such self-sacrificing men, though they occur in all communities, are never numerous. In that long-drawn battle the most grossly exaggerated statements on all points in opposition to the Chinese were made and accepted by the prejudiced as truth. It was stated that there were 2,000,000 Chinese in California, whereas the Custom House reports show that, subtracting those who left the country from those who came in, there were never at any time over 100,000 in the State. Of these, 25,000 drifted to other parts of the country, leaving at most but 75,000 in California.

The Chinese are not a migratory people. They are very set in their ways, and are averse to moving to strange fields, and thus severing the ties that have bound them to their country for generations. Migratory peoples are always aggressive; they enter insidiously at first, and then push their way by force of arms. This has never been a characteristic of the Chinese. China is surrounded by small states, Corea, Japan, the Philippines, Java, Sumatra, Siam, Annam, and Borneo. These are trifling provinces when compared with China, and the latter could have overrun and annexed them hundreds of years ago if she had desired. They are all rich in natural resources, and are highly inviting as fields for Chinese industry. But the Chinese Government has never disturbed them; and the Chinese people have never entered their fields in more than casual numbers. The Chinese in the United States come from two or three districts in Kwang-tung province. It would be difficult, and perhaps impossible, to induce individuals of the lower classes from other parts of China to leave their country for any other. They are satisfied with China, and are willing to plod along in the footsteps of their fathers. And even among the Kwang-tungs it is a grave matter for a man to tear himself apart from his family, friends, and surroundings, to launch out upon a new venture in an unknown land. It requires some nerve and intellectual force in the man, besides a strong incentive.

In the case of the building of the Central Pacific Railroad the incentive was strong. The coolies thought they were leaving China with the certainty of finding employment at remunerative wages. No man intended to remain abroad, any more than did the New England settlers when they came to California in search of gold. The Chinaman proposed to work and save money, and with the latter to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

return to his home in China, to pass the balance of his days. That the Chinese worked hard is true, but that thousands of them returned with no money is also an undeniable fact. Many of them invested their earnings in small industries in the State, having decided to remain and establish themselves as members of the community.

Had the Kwang-tungs not been induced to leave their native land upon the definite offers made for their labor, they still might have immigrated to this country; but they would have come in small bands, just as they now drop into Canada and Mexico. They would have spread abroad in a gradual way, and their value as acquisitions to the population would have been recognized from the material wealth which they would have produced, from their enterprise in the small ways with which white men will not concern themselves, and from their laboring in situations in which whites will not work. Had such been the case the Chinese would not have worked for less wages than the whites. This is manifest from the fact that in California to-day they will not work for wages at which white labor can be procured. Chinese cooks and household servants command from forty to fifty dollars per month, and are the best servants on the coast. Chinese laborers get thirty dollars per month, while in San Francisco alone hundreds of white men are daily taking jobs which do not pay them more than twenty-five dollars per month, and, in addition, have to board themselves. In San Francisco there is a large firm of Chinese fruit-packers employing perhaps 300 hands. A few years ago they discharged all their Chinese help, and put white girls in their stead, for the sole reason that the latter would work for less wages than Chinese would accept when the quantity of work was considered. That they found this policy to be wise is demonstrated by the fact that after a trial of three years they are still tabooing the Chinese and employing whites.

A California surveyor-general, testifying before the Congressional Investigating Committee which held its sessions in San Francisco in 1876, declared that the Chinese, up to that time, had added $289,700,000 to the wealth of California in the redemption of the tule lands alone. Had they enjoyed freedom of access to the country up to the present, there can be no question that they would have produced more than ten times that sum in material wealth forced from the California soil and worked up into various industrial forms. California's loss through the operation of the exclusion laws has been the greatest calamity ever befalling the State. She is a billion dollars

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

poorer to-day than she would have been had the exclusion laws never been passed. This is a palpable fact, and the sooner the productive and commercial elements of the State wake up to this truth and demand the repeal of the statute, the better it will be for their own resources and the general welfare.

Chinese fit into the world's industry in ways which do not conflict with white labor. They work up the odds and ends of materials and convert them into useful forms. The tule lands mentioned were reed swamps upon which whites would not work at any price, owing to the prevalence of malaria. During the past summer many tons of fruit were dumped overboard from the wharves at San Francisco because the canneries were full, and hundreds of tons were left rotting on the trees for lack of a market. With a considerable Chinese population in the State, there would have been those who would have bought up all this waste fruit and put it through some form of preservation that would have made it a marketable product. In California to-day thousands of acres of gold placer-land are being worked by Chinese, the returns from which are so small per cubic yard that white miners will not bother with it; yet the Chinese—the most faithful and persistent of laborers—make a good living out of it, and add large annual sums to the gold output of the State.

And so it is in many forms of industry. If the Chinese were free to come and go, as are the Koreans, the Japanese, the Javanese, the Siamese, there would be hundreds of industries in California, and in the other States, which do not now exist, the materials for which go annually to waste. But if reason should once more prevail on this subject, and the exclusion laws should be repealed, the government would need to assert a strong hand in behalf of the Chinese, for outrages upon our people often occur.

As I write these lines there is before me an item clipped from a morning paper reporting an assault which has just been made upon a body of Chinese by some lawless white men, at Lindsay, California. Owing to a scarcity of white labor, the orange growers of that vicinity, in order to avert the loss of their crops, brought in a train-load of Chinese to help with the picking. The white laborers began to hold meetings against the Chinese, and to stir up trouble among the working-people, with the result that a mob gathered with sticks and stones and made an attack upon the unoffending Chinese; driving them from their work; and forcing them to take refuge for their lives in empty box-cars, in which they were hauled away from the place.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Now the white laborers were not harmed in any way by the presence of the Chinese ; every white person thereabouts who desired occupation being employed at full time and full pay so that he could not earn more if he wished. The fruit which the Chinese were picking would, without their labor, have been wasted ; and the preserving of it, which added to the wealth of the community, should have received the commendation of every sober mind. A mob in California is not different from other mobs, and the predominant quality of any mob is that it will respond to any babbler who tries to stir up its passions. The Lindsay assault was an expression of pure race prejudice. If the ranchmen had been picking their fruit with some kind of machinery, to the exclusion of hand work, nothing would have been said to them. Such outbursts of race hatred would not be possible were there not a sentiment in the laws to back them up. The code of the country is to blame ; for the mob at Lindsay simply reflected the spirit that inheres in the law.

But with all the harshness of the exclusion laws they were never designed to affect any but the laboring classes. They were not intended to be used as an instrument to exclude educated men travelling in pursuit of knowledge, merchants coming from China to this country to buy goods or to start an industry here, or those going from this country to China and returning. Such are the men on whose shoulders trade rests, and it was never for an instant proposed that the statute should act as a sword to sever the trade relations of the countries. Yet we recognize that this very thing is now being done ; though, I believe, unwittingly. A great President of the United States once said, "The way to secure the repeal of a bad law is to enforce it." So it may be that Providence has designed the method now being pursued by the Chinese Department of the Immigration Bureau to show the people of the United States, and particularly the present wise and broad-minded Administration, that the exclusion laws do harm to this country in its trade with the Orient, that they kill new industries, and that they foretell the destruction of the very thing which the President and his advisers are trying so hard to establish ; namely, commercial preëminence for the United States in the East.

Since the law denies to Chinese laborers the right to enter the country, there should be, as an offset, a liberal policy regarding the classes allowed to enter. Yet this is not the case. The utmost rigor is exercised toward the merchants and travellers coming to the United

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

States; and no mechanism which ingenuity can devise could more effectually operate to keep these classes away. Scarcely two months have elapsed since sixty-three merchants from Southern China, coming to the United States for commercial purpose, were prevented from landing at San Francisco, because their certificates disclosed that a word had not been translated from the Chinese original into the English—a lack which may have been as much the fault of the American representative in China who viséd the papers as of the Chinese official who issued them. The English version recited that they were merchants, but did not state what kind of merchants.

The Chinese official representatives in the United States tried hard to secure the landing of these people upon some kind of an arrangement whereby they would not be put to the loss and inconvenience of returning to China merely to have such a small defect corrected. But the Department was inexorable, ignoring all former decisions and precedents. No regard was paid as to how much these intending purchasers in American markets lost by the delay, nor was there any doubt expressed as to whether or not they had come to this country to buy their goods. They were compelled to return to China, and the reports received from them state that they will make their purchases in England.

Nor is this harshness confined to the visitors from China. It is extended with even more severity to resident Chinese merchants who go to China intending to return to their business in this country. Many of the Chinese merchants of the United States are exporters to China, and find it necessary to go there once in a few years to look after their affairs. Under a recent ruling of the Department this trade promises to be entirely broken up; for it cannot be imagined that henceforth any merchant will attempt to go to China with any serious hopes of ever getting back to his business in this country.

The law requires that a merchant leaving the United States and desiring to return shall provide himself with a certificate, and with two white witnesses who will testify that they have known the merchant for a year prior to his departure, and that he has been a merchant during that time. Under the construction put upon this by the Chinese Inspectors' Department, and under the instruction of the Treasury Department and the rules which have been formulated thereupon, the witnesses must testify that they knew the merchant every day continuously during that period, and that they severally knew that he did nothing else and had no other interests than that of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

keeping a store. It is obvious that no person could swear to this knowledge about the affairs of another; and if any one attempted to do so a little cross-examination would break him down.

Further than this, Chinese merchants returning by way of San Francisco to remote points in the United States are detained in that port until their papers are sent to their home towns and viséd by the postmaster of the place, a banker, or some other witness. This is the practice employed by the Bureau, notwithstanding the fact that the merchant upon leaving the country deposits a duplicate of his certificate with the Bureau. When he returns, he presents the original, the duplicate is dug up, and then, and not till then, are the papers sent back to his home to be verified. If personal enemies, or any of those who are opposed to the Chinese as a race, are consulted, they will of course make an unfavorable report. As a consequence, the merchant is prevented from landing, and his business, his property, and all else are lost to him. At least he must settle his affairs through whomsoever he can get to act for him, without any chance of defending himself against the acts of those who might seek to take advantage of him under the circumstances. By the ruling of the Bureau, the certificate which the merchant prepares before he leaves, and which, under the law, would entitle him to reënter the country, means nothing. It can be swept aside by the adverse report of one of the persons to whom it is sent for visé, and this very thing is repeatedly done.

It occurred recently that a merchant from an interior town had his certificate witnessed by the postmaster of the place of his residence. He went away, and on his return the certificate was sent to the same postoffice for examination. It happened that the postmaster who had signed the certificate was then out of office, and that a successor had been appointed. This person knew nothing about the merchant; but—being doubtless an enemy of his predecessor—he stated as a general proposition that his predecessor was unreliable and could not be believed about anything. Thereupon, and upon that statement alone, the merchant was denied landing, and all of his business interests and property were lost, in order that a political grudge might be satisfied.

While this certificate is travelling back to the home town of the merchant to get the endorsement of the postmaster—an utterly unnecessary performance—the merchant is kept a prisoner in a dirty dungeon in San Francisco, called the Detention Loft. While there

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

he is not allowed to see any one from the outside, or to communicate with any except those within, and is under the constant surveillance of a customs officer. He suffers here sometimes for weeks, but often for months. It is common for those imprisoned to plead with the Inspectors of the Bureau to allow them to return to China and lose all their possessions in the United States, rather than endure a longer period of such confinement. I recall also the case of a merchant, returning to his home in Montana, who was held in this loft until his papers were sent to that town to be confirmed. The months rolled by, and the papers did not come back. Finally, believing they never would be returned, and the merchant's supply of money having given out, some friends in San Francisco sent him back to China. The papers arrived all correct four months after they had been sent away; but they were of no avail to the merchant. He was in China, possibly driven to distraction or destruction.

In this prison are held, for long periods, Chinese gentlemen worth hundreds of thousands of dollars; men of vast interests, tea merchants, scholars, owners of extensive establishments of chinaware, bankers, owners of ships. They are deprived of their liberty, and subjected to indignities of exquisite refinement, while their pecuniary loss is beyond computation. Indeed, it does not seem possible to devise a scheme whereby greater impediment, discomfort, and hardship could be imposed upon the merchants of China doing business in this country in an orderly manner. By recent rulings of the Treasury Department all Chinese bankers, lawyers, doctors, teachers, and missionaries are debarred from the United States as not being entitled to enter this country—a ruling which was never made or thought of before, and which entails an additional hardship upon the Chinese.

These things, we believe, cannot endure. We have too much faith in the President of this great nation, in the Houses of Congress, in the wisdom of the American people generally, and particularly in those influential producers who have their eyes fixed upon China as a shipping point, not to feel certain that these barriers to trade and progress must be wiped away, and that the broad enlightenment which distinguishes the American people among the nations of the world will soon characterize their dealings with the Chinese as with other peoples.

Ho Yow.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE PRESENT POSITION OF THE IRISH QUESTION.

THE Irish Question, which, from the date of the revolt against Parnell, steadily declined in importance and public interest, has suddenly come to the front again, and, after the war, occupies the foremost place in the public mind in England to-day.

The process by which this result has been brought about is significant, and is worth investigating. The war of aggression against the two small South African Republics must in the nature of things have far-reaching effects upon the future of the British Empire ; but what would have been thought of any one who suggested at its commencement that one of its effects might be the advancement, perhaps the settlement, of the Irish Question ?

Yet to-day this may be said to be within the range of probability. When the war commenced Ireland was divided into at least three or four separate political camps, each busily engaged in fighting its domestic rivals, to the great amusement and advantage of the common enemy, England. The cause of this state of disunion, namely, the downfall of Parnell's power, is well known, and there is no need for me to deal with it here. The effects of this disunion are equally a matter of common knowledge. The power of Irish members in the House of Commons was frittered away. The great popular agitation in Ireland, without which Irish members of Parliament are powerless, withered away and died. The support of the Irish people in America and the sympathy of the nations of the world, which sustained Parnell's movement, disappeared, and again English statesmen congratulated themselves on the collapse of the Irish Question.

This was the position of affairs when the South African War began. But an extraordinary and quite unlooked-for result immediately occurred. War in South Africa made peace in Ireland. This war outraged the public conscience of our people. Not that they had any antecedent ties of sympathy with the Boers, who, in race, religion, and national characteristics, were the very reverse of the Irish. They saw, however, the cause of Ireland to some extent reproduced in the history of the South African Republics. They saw solemn

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

treaties violated; they saw the independence of small and weak states attacked by the same giant who had oppressed Ireland; they saw the same motives underlying the conquest of the Transvaal as had animated the conquerors of Ireland; and their sympathy went out freely to a brave people "rightly struggling to be free."

Next came the painful consciousness of the utter impotence of a disunited Ireland to make her influence felt, or even her voice heard, on behalf of liberty and right; and, suddenly, all dissension in Ireland was hushed. Almost before England realized what was going on Irish leaders and parties had coalesced, and for the first time in ten years the eighty-one Nationalist members appeared as one body on the floor of the House of Commons. Thus, peace in Ireland was produced by war in South Africa. It is only two months since this peace was proclaimed, and already the results are apparent. In Ireland a great popular national organization, on the lines of the old National League, is springing into being. The Irish members in the House of Commons have proclaimed their complete independence of all English parties. They are once more a power and a menace, and the Irish Question has once more arisen phœnix-like from its ashes.

In another way, also, this iniquitous war has served Ireland. It has afforded to English statesmanship a striking object-lesson of the disastrous effects of the past misgovernment of Ireland. Of the policy which led to the war there are many divergent views throughout the British Empire; but once the Empire had become committed to the war, there was an almost unanimous response from all parts of the world—from all the children of that Empire—to the call to arms. From Australia and Canada willing aid came to the Empire in its difficulty and its peril. From one land alone in all that world-wide Empire there was no friendly response, but, on the contrary, bitter and uncompromising hostility; and that land was Ireland. From wherever free representative institutions had been conceded to the people, from wherever the people were permitted to govern themselves, came expressions of loyalty; and it was only from the one land which is still denied its freedom that England looked in vain for good will and assistance. This, I feel sure, has sunk into the public mind of England. It has been emphasized in a truly startling manner by the history of the war. On the field of battle England has in the end been obliged to rely upon the genius and the valor of the generals and the soldiers who are the sons of that land which is still vainly clamoring for its rights. The recent visit of the Queen to Ireland is

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a proof of what I say ; and more than likely has served to intensify the feeling which undoubtedly exists in England at this moment—that Ireland has been treated unjustly, and that the Empire itself has suffered severely in its prestige and its power by the injustice. The Queen has returned, or perhaps I should say she ought to have returned, from Ireland convinced that if Ireland is worth keeping it is worth conciliating and must be conciliated.

I believe we are rapidly nearing a great development of this Irish Question. I have always believed that the Local Government Act which came into operation last year was the greatest step, and the step that will count most, in the granting of Home Rule. There is no denying the fact that the defeat of Mr. Gladstone's Home Rule schemes was due to the belief on the part of the masses of the English people—a belief instilled into their minds by unscrupulous politicians —that the Irish people in their own country were incapable of governing themselves in a sober, steady, and tolerant fashion ; that religious rancor and class hatreds were so intense that it was impossible for men of different creeds and parties and classes to work amicably together under free institutions.

It was with fear and trembling that England consented to the passage into law of the Local Government Act. Under that measure there is intrusted to public bodies, elected by the widest popular franchise, the administration of all the local affairs of every county and city in Ireland. The assessment and disbursement of all taxes for local purposes—in fact, complete administrative, as distinguished from legislative, control of local, as distinguished from national, affairs is placed absolutely in the hands of the people. Up to last year these functions were entirely in the hands of the nominees of the Crown. Now what has been the result of this change? The working of the new system has been a complete and admitted success. The administration of local affairs has been better and more economical than it ever was before. Men of all religions and politics and classes have been elected to these boards. Landlords and tenants, Catholics and Protestants, Orangemen and Nationalists sit side by side and amicably transact the business of the country. I say the success of this Act destroys the chief argument against Home Rule ; and I believe the day is near at hand when, by general assent, Ireland will obtain Legislative Home Rule in a Parliament in Dublin.

There is another question very near to the heart of Ireland, which, by general assent, is rapidly nearing its solution. I mean the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

great problem of the higher education of our Catholic youth. At present the Catholic youth of Ireland may be said to be without university training; and, in view of this fact, the number of Irishmen who rise to distinction in every walk of life and in every land is an astonishing tribute to the natural genius of the race.

This problem is probably little known by American readers, and it may be of interest to explain it in a few words. The British Government in the days of Elizabeth founded and endowed the University of Dublin as an exclusively Protestant institution for the purpose of planting the Protestant religion in Ireland. It remained exclusively Protestant for 200 years; and, notwithstanding some efforts made within the last fifty years to extend the benefits of the education given there to other denominations, it remains practically a Protestant institution at the present day. The governing body is entirely Protestant; the teaching body is entirely Protestant; and its traditions are entirely Protestant. It has a Protestant Divinity school within its walls, a Protestant chapel, a Protestant service, and Protestant preachers. Mr. Balfour has admitted over and over again that Trinity College is practically a Protestant institution; and he recently declared that if it were as Catholic in fact as it is Protestant, he should consider it a very unsuitable place of education for Protestant parents to send their children to.

Under the circumstances Catholic parents do not send their children to Dublin University. No one wants to tamper with existing endowments. What is asked is simply equality. The demand is based upon the fact that Catholics pay taxes as well as Protestants, that they are equally anxious to get university education and equally fit to profit by it. This claim is now supported by leading men on both sides of the House of Commons, and its triumph is inevitable.

We are on the eve of a dissolution of Parliament. Should Lord Roberts reach Pretoria before the harvest a general election will, it is generally believed, immediately follow. Whatever party is returned to power, the reunited Irish members, in all human probability, will be masters of the situation. The educational reform of which I have been speaking, a further reform of the land question, the redress of the financial injustice under which we suffer, Home Rule itself, are all, in my opinion, well within our grasp, if we can preserve our ranks unbroken and can secure the support and confidence of our fellow countrymen abroad for a few short years more. J. E. Redmond.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

DO WE OWE INDEPENDENCE TO THE FILIPINOS?

RECENTLY, with graceful rhetoric and in a distinguished forum, it has been argued that the Filipinos were our allies against Spain, and the conclusion drawn is that honor requires us to acknowledge their independence. The charge has been often refuted, but now it comes in such a formidable guise that it must, in the interest of historic truth, be answered again.

Let us, as briefly as we can, cite the witnesses who deny the charge. In the preliminary statement of the old Philippine Commission, bearing date of November 2, 1899, Admiral Dewey says: "No alliance of any kind was entered into with Aguinaldo, nor was any promise of independence made to him then (May 19, 1898) or at any other time." Under date of December 18, 1899, Gen. Merritt says: "There was positively no agreement between Aguinaldo, or any of his representatives, and myself that looked toward coöperation between us." (See the New York "Independent" of January 4, 1900.) August 13, 1898, Aguinaldo wrote to Gen. Anderson: "My troops are forced by yours, by means of threats of violence, to retire from positions taken." (See page 399, Senate Document No. 62.)

In a proclamation issued by Aguinaldo at Malolos January 5, 1899, he said: "The Americans . . disembarked forces at the town of Paranaque, and took up positions all along the line occupied by my troops . . taking possession of many trenches constructed by my own people, by the employment of astuteness, *not unaccompanied by violence.* They forced a capitulation on the garrison of Manila. . . In this I took a very active part, *although I was not notified.*" July 28, 1898, Consul Pratt wrote to his government: "I held out no hopes to him of any kind, committed the Government in no way whatever, and in the course of our conferences never acted upon the assumption that the Government would *coöperate* with him (Gen. Aguinaldo) for the furtherance of any plan of his own. . ." (See page 358, Senate Document No. 62.)

Gen. Anderson wrote to Aguinaldo, July 23, 1898, that if he did not aid him in securing horses and supplies he would have to pass him

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and make requisition directly on the people. (See Senate Document No. 62, page 394.) Gen. Greene (see Senate Document No. 62, page 43) says that Aguinaldo did much to thwart Gen. Anderson, going so far, in a letter of July 23, 1898, as to warn Gen. Anderson not to land troops on Philippine soil without his consent. On February 4, 1899, at Malolos, Aguinaldo declared war; proclaiming that peace and friendly relations between the Philippine forces and the American forces of occupation were broken, and that the latter would be treated as enemies. (See Otis Report, page 95.) In August, 1898, Aguinaldo asked Consul Williams, "Why do not the American generals operate in conjunction with the Filipino generals?" (Senate Document No. 62, page 398.)

All these quotations tend to show that there is no truth in the charge that the Filipinos were our allies. There is just as little truth in the allegation that all the Filipinos are supporting Aguinaldo and fighting us. Practically this war is waged by the Tagalos, who number a million and a half of people. In an article published in "The Independent" of April 19, 1900, Lieut. Horace M. Reeve, aide-de-camp to Gen. J. C. Bates, says that up to date in the southern islands of the Philippine Archipelago no American soldier had been called on to fire a shot. These southernmost islands, he declares, include nearly one-half of the Philippines, "containing besides the Sulu Archipelago the islands of Mindanao and Paragua, which are respectively the second and third largest islands after Luzon; other small islands are included in this district."

The statement made by Lieut. Reeve as to the condition of Mindanao must be qualified by recent advices. There has been some disorder lately in that island caused by robber bands in the mountains. In fact, even in Luzon the attacks on our troops come from banditti, who pillage the natives on all occasions. According to the recent utterances of Gen. Otis there is no longer any organized resistance to us in any island.

It is well known that the tribe of the Macabeebes has declared for us *en masse*, and has sent troops to fight for us and with us. It certainly will not be disputed that the island of Negros openly indorsed and adopted our cause. Nor will it be disputed that there are many Filipinos of the highest standing at Manila who are our friends, and that numbers of them have taken the oath of allegiance. These people all want us to stay in the islands. It would appear, therefore, that a majority of the Filipinos are friendly to us. If that be so, how

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

far shall the doctrine that we must have the consent of the governed be construed to extend? Does it mean that we must have the consent of all the governed, or does it mean the majority of the governed? In either case at least a little time ought to be conceded to the Administration to ascertain what the wish of the people really is.

If this doctrine means that every Tagalo must become loyal before we can lawfully annex Luzon, it is probably true that there never can be a lawful annexation. Under such conditions no government in the world would stand a minute, not even our own. Under such a construction no gun could have been lawfully fired against the people of the South in 1861. To require absolutely, and literally, that every person shall consent to a form of government before it can operate on him is simply anarchy. To this complexion the anti-imperialist is rapidly coming. He is imitating his French predecessors, and, in his love of abstract freedom, he is rushing into a carnival of license unbridled by law.

The total area of the Philippine Islands is 115,000 square miles. The area of Mindanao is 37,500 square miles; of Palawan (or Paragua), 5,630; Negros, 3,090; the Sulu Archipelago, 775; the Calamianes, 339 square miles. The Malolos government never held or controlled any of these islands. We do hold and control them, and by what principle shall we be called on to surrender them? We bought them from Spain, and we hold them by their own consent.

The anti-imperialist asserts that Spain had no rightful sovereignty over the Philippine Islands. Why not? She had ruled them for 300 years. Even on his own theory the claim of the anti-imperialist must be practically limited to the island of Luzon. Looking, then, at Luzon alone, what was its condition when Dewey arrived there? When Admiral Dewey arrived at Manila there was no insurrection existing. In the Preliminary Report of the Philippine Commission, page 7, in a memorandum expressly stated to have been furnished by the Admiral (page 4), he says: "Upon the arrival of the squadron at Manila it was found that there was no insurrection to speak of, and it was accordingly decided to allow Aguinaldo to come to Cavite on board of the 'McCulloch.'" Aguinaldo called on the commander-in-chief, "after which he was allowed to land at Cavite and organize an army."

Why did the Admiral allow Aguinaldo to land and organize an army? He answers that question himself on page 4, cited: "This was done with the purpose of strengthening the United States forces

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and weakening those of the enemy." It is not uncommon for a nation at war to stir up rebellion against the opposing sovereign among his people. It was claimed that England stirred up the Indian tribes against us. It is, however, the first time in history that it has been claimed that an insurrection so produced creates an estoppel against a warring nation to take for itself the territory in which the insurrection broke out.

Wars will be greatly simplified hereafter if the fact that an insurrection is fostered by one belligerent shall be a conclusive reason that it cannot annex by treaty the particular territory which is in insurrection. The military man of the future will sedulously avoid making any use of the people who live in the seat of war. If he asks for wagons and horses, as Anderson did, he is acknowledging the independence of the rebels against his own country as well as all others. If he renders the least assistance, as Dewey did, he is bound to install the rebel leader as ruler. According to this reasoning, when we recruited colored soldiers in Alabama during our war we bound ourselves to make that State free and independent.

How do we hold Porto Rico? Some people say that she rebelled against Spain and came to us voluntarily, and we have had many fine bursts of eloquence on that account. Other people, including, notably, Gen. George W. Davis, say that we bought the island, or conquered it, or both. In a paper printed in the "Washington Post," Tuesday, April 24, 1900, Gen. Davis, over his own signature, quoting from testimony given by him, says: "It seems to me . . that the persons composing the Porto Rico population whom we forcibly annexed to the United States, or brought them under our sovereignty without consulting them, have as good a moral right to enjoy trade privileges as have the inhabitants of Hawaii."

Take either horn of the dilemma. If the Porto Ricans rebelled against Spain they are entitled to their independence; and if, as Gen. Davis says, we conquered them, they are still more entitled to it. According to the anti-imperialist we cannot hold people whose territory we buy, nor people that we conquer. We can hold nobody who does not come voluntarily, and this rule extends to every man, woman, and child. If this discovery had been made a century ago we would have had no territory now but the thirteen colonies—if even we could have held them. We must reject "a cession of sovereignty, which implies that sovereignty may be bought and sold and delivered without the consent of the people."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

What moonshine is this doctrine! Let us give back to France the Louisiana purchase, to Virginia the northwest territory, California to Mexico, Alaska to Russia. There is not a recorded line in any of the treaties making cessions of territory to us, or to any nation in the world, which provides for the consent of the occupants thereof. Evidently such a thing is impracticable. If France had insisted on such a theory there would have been no cession of Alsace and Lorraine. It is quite doubtful, also, whether, if the people of the Louisiana purchase had been polled, they would have ever given up allegiance to their adored France. There cannot be much doubt that if our brethren of the South had been accorded the privilege "of the consent of the governed," there would be here now four republics, or monarchies, instead of one great and indestructible Union, which honorably and rightly and justly—in spite of all this sentimentalism—was pinned together by bayonets.

Again, we hear that Spain could not rightfully sell sovereignty to us, and that we could not rightfully buy it from her. Why not? Presumably because by our prestige, by our arms, Spain had been rendered powerless and Aguinaldo had roamed at will over Luzon. All that was done while the war was on. Every act done by the rebels and ourselves was an incident in the great drama of war, whose end and solution did not come until December 10, 1898. It was anciently the doctrine that one could not buy property which was held in adverse possession by another person than the proposed vendor—that you could not buy a lawsuit. I believe, though I cannot speak positively, that, in Indiana at least, that doctrine has been exploded. It never did apply to nations.

In this particular case, if we grant that native insurgents may rise against the power which has owned and governed them for 300 years, may hold a small part of the Archipelago without any acknowledgment by any nation of their independence, and may, on the ground of occupation only, claim territory as their own—still what becomes of Manila? Aguinaldo never held that city. What becomes of the islands whose names are hereinbefore cited? If the doctrine of *uti possidetis* is to prevail, we should still hold the chief city and one-half of the islands.

The legal argument should be abandoned. The anti-imperialist should rest his case on simple charity, on philanthropy, on quotations from the Scriptures. In this realm of reasoning there are vast fields of gentle suggestions, which commend themselves to many excellent

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

people. Unquestionably there is great division as to the mode of carrying them out. Many persons believe that to build up a great free government in the Orient is a splendid work. Many persons think that to take free institutions to a nation that has been enslaved is a noble thing to do. To transplant our benign laws to the Philippines, to divorce church and state, to establish common schools and colleges, to bestow individual freedom on the people—these are great and honorable ends. Say that we are all agreed on these principles, there still remains a consideration of the mode in which we are to accomplish them.

The anti-imperialist says, "I would require all foreign governments to keep out of the islands." How would you do that if you gave them independence? What right have you got to interfere with the action of an independent country? Are you the Don Quixote of the world to break a lance for all peoples? Is there a particular text of international law which authorizes you, having no material interest in a country, to intervene for a whim of the diseased imagination? Whenever your rights under international law are touched wrongfully, light the fuses and prepare for war; but do not wander around the world always attacking the governments of other peoples, always fostering insurrection, always boasting of yourselves.

We so-called imperialists desire as ardently as the anti-imperialists to keep foreign nations from securing ownership of the islands, and in order to do so we think we ought to hold and keep them as and for our own. We are advised to "offer to the people of the Philippines our help in maintaining order until they have had a reasonable opportunity to establish a government of their own." If we to-day announce to the Filipinos that we intend to hold them for only a "reasonable" time, we shall by that announcement give the reins to anarchy. Every foreign merchant will leave the islands. He will not live under Filipino rule. Every native who is now for us will turn against us.

It is the opinion of Gen. Otis, recently expressed, that the war has been largely fomented by professional politicians, who expected to make a fortune out of the agitation. The property owners, says Otis, are tired of the struggle, but they implore us to remain in the islands. They anticipate anarchy when we leave, which will end in absorption by a foreign power.

If we announce that we intend to hold the islands temporarily only, no native who is now friendly will ever befriend us. The

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Tagalo and many of his friends in this country claim that this very day he is capable of governing himself without our assistance. If it is right that these people should be independent, why postpone the day? According to recent utterances, their state papers are the finest in the world, and they possess every qualification for independence. This is nonsense, of course, but it is pleasing to the ear of the professional agitator.

If, after all the fighting, we announce that we are beaten, we shall be considered as trespassers and intruders, and such we shall be, because if we are not going to hold the islands we have no business whatever there. I understand individual charity, but I do not understand why the people of this country should be taxed to support a great army and navy to create for an alien people a government in which we are to have no share.

It is curious that, amidst all this war of words, no member of Congress has been found brave enough to introduce a bill rescinding the Treaty of Paris, declaring the Tagalos free, and proposing to withdraw our troops. Let that be done. Let us find out whether the political party that wins in November will declare either for immediate evacuation, or for a tutelage extending over a short period of years. Such a platform would no doubt rally to its support many eloquent dreamers, but it would be condemned by the great body of the practical people. Other propositions announced by the anti-imperialist orators go over again the doctrine of non-interference by the European powers, and are simply amplifications of what has been already commented on.

If there is such great danger of foreign interference had we not better hold the islands? No country then will interfere with them. England has belted the globe with possessions. Even now she is conquering new ones, and Europe and ourselves hold our hands. The world stood by while we stripped Spain of her colonies. There will be no danger from any source as long as our Flag flies in Luzon. We cannot tell what may happen when it is removed. We cannot foresee the civil strife, the anarchy, the foreign aggressions that may occur. As much as we love freedom, we cannot pledge ourselves in advance to secure, at all hazards, to the Tagalo not only independence, but indefinite possession of the Archipelago. Why not leave the question to be decided in the future? When another Australia shall have risen above the tropic seas, when another Canada shall have been born on the equator, it will be time enough to weigh the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

issue what to do with the Philippines. Let us not throw now a new apple of discord among them.

In all the argument that I have been reviewing there has been nothing said about the fact that Aguinaldo made war on us. Always our country is held to blame. From the 13th day of August, 1898, when Manila was taken by our troops, to the 5th day of February, 1899, he kept the armed ranks of great numbers of troops investing our lines. By what right did he besiege us? On that day he let loose the dogs of war. Praise his courage, his patriotism, his ability of composition! You have done it handsomely. You have just failed to place him on the same pedestal that Washington stands on. Let him stand in history, if you please, with the great defeated leaders of rebellion, with Jefferson Davis and Kossuth.

Yes, we can all—even the imperialists—admire heroism and gallantry, although we deplore their exhibition in a wrongful cause. But for Aguinaldo to make war on us after he had been assured by Gen. Otis on all possible occasions that we would not make war on him, that we would only defend ourselves, was the stupendous blunder of a misinformed and misguided man. He imagined that we would not fight, that he could drive us into the sea. He imagined, too, that a majority of our own people would applaud his butchery of our soldiers. He has consolidated our people against him. Whether the Constitution goes with the Flag or not, when the Flag is fired on every honorable instinct of our nature rises for its defence. Whatever betide, we will stand by the soldiers who are fighting under the Flag; and in this particular case we do it proudly, because no Christian gentlemen ever bore more insult and contumely than they did before—at last and in self-defence—they answered the murderous volleys that were fired at them.

CHARLES DENBY.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

COLLEGE PHILOSOPHY.

A FEW years ago I gathered and printed a list of some 300 text-books upon logic, ethics, psychology, metaphysics, and allied philosophic departments, which have been used in American colleges. Nearly a score and a half of these I have used myself, and I have looked over more than 150. In nearly all the eighteen colleges at work in this country at the beginning of this century, and in the great majority of the 400 that have since been founded, these are the culminating subjects, especially of the A.B. course, taught usually in the last two years by the President, around whose personality in old times the entire course centred, as it does now in small colleges.

Under the old *régime*, as in the "Laws, Liberties and Orders" of Harvard, confirmed annually from 1642 to 1646, everything focussed in religion. The bachelor's degree was given to each scholar able to read the originals of the Old and New Testaments into the Latin tongue and to resolve them logically. The master's degree required a synopsis of logic and a defence of theses. Mather in his "Magnalia" regrets that at Harvard they show less veneration for Aristotle than at Oxford. Progress consisted in adding New Testament Greek and then Hebrew, including systems of divinity, especially those of Wollebius and Ames.

The logic cult, however, was first and most persistent, because it was not only the organon of law, but also, and far more so, of theology and the method of divinity. Disputations, weekly and semi-weekly, were the focus of interest, and everything centred about correct methods of syllogistic reasoning and the avoidance of fallacies. The rules of deduction were the norms of all thinking, divine or human, and logic was the tool by which the church wrought out its system. It was the guide of life, the culmination of the higher education, and the only recognized method of investigation.

The next period may perhaps be most conveniently marked by Whitfield's advent in New England, in 1740. He complained that college instructors neglected to pray with, and examine the hearts of, their pupils; that most schools and universities had sunk into "new

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

seminaries of paganism" ; and that their light had become "a darkness that could be felt." His revivalism, with its "sudden and temporary turns of distress and joy," with its "furious zeal . . which hath in many places burned into the very vitals of religion," nevertheless resulted in an essential change of spirit in most evangelical American colleges.

Durfee shows how the early history of Williams College was chiefly marked by efforts to secure the conversion of the students. Its dark periods were years of spiritual drouth, and its bright hours were the seasons of awakening, as in 1825, when there were "thirty converts in thirty days." In his account of Amherst, Hitchcock says that its religious history is "more important and interesting than anything pertaining to it." He enumerates fourteen revivals up to 1863, and estimates that 350 gave themselves to Christ there, very many of whom determined to enter the Christian ministry. Whatever else may be said of this movement, it is impossible to read the histories of the colleges of these days without recognizing from this source a great access of interest and vitality to its philosophical work. The very least that can be said of it is that it met after a fashion a certain need of adolescence, and gave instructors a new hold upon student life.

A third ethical movement may be marked by the brief introduction to the study of ethics written by President Clapp of Yale for his students, in 1765, and also by the work of the Alford chair at Harvard, in 1789. Clapp sought to place upon the right foundations the old morality—which colleges had taught previously in an incidental way—that "Virtue is not by nature, but by a divine gift" ; that the chief rule is to avoid anomia or sin ; that Greek philosophy came from Moses and the prophets, etc. Ethics encountered great opposition at first, and never came to its independent rights until the Unitarian movement. Faith was deemed better than works ; even if these were not mere "filthy rags," they could not save men. As early as 1716 Cotton Mather condemned even the rudimentary ethics then taught at Harvard as a "vile form of paganism" at best : for him ethics was "impietas in artis formam redacta." It suggested Cicero, Plutarch, and perhaps even the Stoa.

If this prejudice existed in the logical, it was greatly intensified under the revivalistic, *régime*, and after deists had attacked the clergy for a century in the name of ethics and natural religion. Mark Hopkins, with his semi-theological ethics, was a radical innovation

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in the eyes of President Griffin, his predecessor, who preferred to appeal, as he could so urgently, to the exhortation to instant repentance.

Although taught from the first, it was only after revivalism and interest in its political branch—favored by the Declaration of Independence and the liberalizing thought of Channing—that ethics slowly advanced to an academic position first beside, and then above, logic. Unlike the former, it developed a distinctively American type, and, more than any other collegiate department, came to represent our national *ethos*. At first theological, virtue consisted in likeness to God. His will was the supreme warrant of duty ; impenitence and unbelief were among the chief sins. The whole of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and part of the nineteenth, showed only a very slow transition from the view that morality was a code revealed in the Scriptures to the conception that it was best studied in the innate intuitions and sentiments of man. Dreary as Clark, Shaftesbury, Cudworth, Hutchinson, Adam Smith, Beattie, Mackintosh, and even Paley seem to us, they humanized ethics by transferring its criterion from the arbitrary behest of an extra-mundane being to the same inner oracle that Socrates revered.

In this country political rights and duties are also laid down in our text-books on ethics, even the good Quaker Dymond almost justifying war. Since MacBride the physiological factor has appeared ; and this subject, broadened by Jouffroy, later developed into the most nationally characteristic of all branches. If we widen our view to include the scores of books for young men and women, sermons, courses, guides, and manuals, we shall realize the uniqueness of this American product. Manuals like those of Gow, Comyges, and Yonge, and such as the French Government now authorizes, contain records of good deeds and lives ; others treat each virtue serially with various methods of grouping ; while in still others theory comes to prominence. From all this it is plain that, next to the religious motive, one of the great mainsprings of the higher education has been the desire to impart to collegiate youth the best moral influences, motives, and ideals, and that instruction in this field will lose its chief support in public sentiment if it is not made practically effective here.

The old deductive logic of Aristotle began as a set of rules for the game of dialectics among the disputatious Greeks. The charm of personal encounter and rejoinder, of dialogue and colloquy, from the sophists to the great forensics of Abelard and the theses of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Luther, has given zest to this work. In the early American colleges, at the weekly or semi-weekly debates, imaginary responders were set up if there were no real ones. It was the method by which all the doctrines of theology and metaphysics were forged out and forced home upon reluctant minds. It was the organon of the soul in dealing with ideals, categories, and intellectual species; and one portion, the forms of predication, created its handmaid, grammar.

Logic presided over rhetoric and oratory, in which Roman education culminated, and which have always cadenced the soul of ingenuous youth. It is the method of classification and of the evidences of Christianity, and is one of the very greatest romances of the human intelligence. Nevertheless, its prestige has declined, and with reason; partly because it has lapsed to the *ex post facto* work of explaining past achievements; partly because its newer forms, induction and Hegelian dialectic, and the forms that Boole and Lotze have tried to give it, have at least broken the charm of the old idolatry.

At adolescence there is a deeper sense of morality than is possible before—a needed tension and stress of emotion. It is a period when, whatever may be the truth about it, it is a wholesome pedagogic method to apply a transcendental supernatural cult, and perhaps to incline youth to regard duties as divine commands, because this method is simply an effective form of appeal to that larger portion of life which is instinctive and emotional and exists before the intellect has fully come to its power. Though the higher religious life be more and more conceived as a growth, and less as a conquest or alien irruption, it is needful to arouse the deepest sense of the sacredness and mystery of duty—to make it a passion, if only as a safeguard against degradation. This tends to make the heart strong, warm, and healthful, to prevent it from growing pessimistic, indifferent, decadent, and makes for that high type of virtue which to be pure must first be passionate.

I doubt if the nerves of collegians now are tonic enough to play, as of yore, those awful and soul-quaking anthems of Socratic conviction of ignorance or of Pauline conviction of sin; nor would I bring back the day of Baxter's "Call" or of the "Admirable Convert." I am clear, however, both as a psychologist and a teacher, that many of our latest text-books in ethics, which volatilize ethical sanctions into metaphysics of the most tenuous kind, which seriously discuss the hedonistic calculus as if the worth of life and even virtue depended on it, or argue that current morality is a survival of a faith now dead, do

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

not tend to sanity in this land of ours. The subtleties of speculative ethics should not obscure the plain sense of right and wrong; and methods that originated with other races and stocks to meet other needs cannot satisfy those of this age and land.

A copy of the first edition of Locke's essay, given to Yale in 1714, two years before Jonathan Edwards entered as a lad of thirteen, has had much to do with the history of philosophic thought at Yale, and in this country generally. At the age of fourteen Edwards read Locke with an enjoyment, as he tells us, such as "the most greedy miser finds when gathering up handfuls of silver and gold." At the age of seventeen he drew Berkeley's conclusion without having read him. This bore little fruit in philosophic instruction for many years; but as the history of philosophy became known, and it was seen how Berkeley's almost juvenile scepticism about the existence of the external world deepened into Hume's disbelief in the *ego* or self, and then widened to Kant and the heroic German age, American philosophers drew back.

With an heroic affirmation of reality, the Scotch school, having common sense as its watchword, short-circuited this tedious *détour*. It held to an immediate conviction of right and wrong, nonsuited the whole question of reality, which was ascribed to an immediate sense, and discussed in the most lucid way practical matters of association, desire, will, feeling, raising no quarrel with religion, and not unsettling the young. Under President McCosh and others, it developed an amicable *modus vivendi* with the new psychology and with religion; it has given to education in this country about all the philosophic basis yet popularly recognized; and it has been in wholesome and fructifying rapport with practical life at every point. The psychology of common sense, as represented by many text-books of the Porter type, does business on the basis of a vast capital of material. It has only the difficulties about it which are inherent in every large and well-compacted field of thought, without requiring the mind to get into an unreal, falsetto attitude. It became a synthesis only less uniquely and characteristically national in this field than the constructions in ethics; and at one time it seemed likely to become dominant everywhere, despite the transcendental and Hegelian cult that formed such an important, though chiefly non-academic, episode of a decade or two.

The method of the modern professorial shepherd of souls, if he holds that the so-called "theory of knowledge" is central among the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

philosophic disciplines, is often something as follows: He meets a class of juniors or seniors absorbed in objective life—science, literature, art, or history. First, perhaps, he takes an objective subject—the brain, hypnotism, something experimental; and then, or without any such prelude, raises the question of the trustworthiness of sensation. That color, sound, and other secondary qualities are subjective it is very easy to prove. How about form, weight, or extension? The retina inverts its images, which are at best on a curved surface of two dimensions, and the brain cells involved are doubtless distributed in an entirely disparate way. The subtle Bishop of Cloyne, who in his youthful years denied that the eye could ever inform us of reality, and led us to infer that even the mother sense of touch was no less incompetent to do so, and in his mature years preached the gospel of tar-water, is the usual guide through the outer circles of this facile descent to Avernus.

Having lost the external world, Hume is invoked for the next lower circle, at the completion of which the young novitiate understands that there is also really no *ego* or self. The Kantian baptism follows, and it is now a very easy lesson that space and time have no existence save in the mind that creates them. The great and blooming cosmos, then, is an eject, project, objectivation of something subjective, so that at bottom, as the residuum of the Cartesian exhortation to doubt as radically as possible, there is no real and sure thing in all the universe save the present thought or sensation of the individual.

This *ens realissimum* is then the goal beyond which we cannot go. It is the only *aliquod inconcussum* which no scepticism can question. This flitting present psychic stuff is the primordial material of experience; but in itself it is unconnectable with any other psychic state save indirectly or by mere sequence. It has no value; it is not mine, because there is no self save as one or a group of these states; there is no past or future except as the other of these states. They are, in themselves, absolutely non-spacial, incommunicable, and indescribable; and from them we can infer nothing strictly concerning even the existence of an external world, much less concerning the relations of things in it.

This volute or solipsistic hoppo is the pilgrim's first goal. It is one of the newer, but already most worn, of all the pot-holes in the great, roaring, eddying current of human thought. It is attractive, to be sure, but to a somewhat different class of minds from those that of old muddled themselves over the tortoise and Achilles, the possibility

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of motion in a flying arrow, or the *syllogismus crocodilus*. Indeed, although appealing to the same mildly paranœic minds, it has a different, and perhaps deeper, root. The precept of doubting to the uttermost may be applied to religious belief. Religious and ethical foundations are then the first to reel and totter under the influence of the spirit that always denies. The youth who takes this in earnest soon finds himself reduced from confidence to an ignorance that seems hopeless.

Physical trainers tell us that few men strip well. This is also true when the Carlylean clothes of convention, opinion, belief, and every vestige of the creed of childhood are stripped off. Even those who have not themselves actually been scorched in this hell of adolescence, but have come within full sight of it, have had their mental eyeballs seared. They are condemned to regard nature as more or less unreal; for them it is deflowered of its freshness and bloom; natural science must forever be something only moderately commendable to them, and even if it becomes a vocation it is pursued with abated ardor. I often wonder whether any one who has been subjected to a vigorous treatment of this kind in youth has ever attained eminence afterward in the study of any of the sciences of nature. It has a worse and more blighting effect in that it teaches one to distrust the deepest instincts of the soul, and makes the whole objective world seem a little afar, as behind a maya-like veil.

This experience, it must be admitted, is often a strange exhilarant for thought and poetic and metaphysical expression. There is a quaint and moving pathos about those who have ever really stood, or even affected to stand, in this Ultima Thule of self-involution. Formerly the ecstatic worked himself up to the seventh heaven and lost the earth in the contemplation of God and superessential being. His modern congener is lost to all else in the contemplation of his own inner states. The latter alone are real and true, and if he ever has any other knowledge or belief, it must be laboriously manufactured out of this mother lye of experience. He is reduced back not to the condition of primitive thinkers before all we call culture existed, but to a hypothetical mesh of weltering, amœboid, psychic rudiments from which he must evolute himself.

Socrates once humorously said that the bridge of his own nose was so low and his eyes so prominent that he could roll the latter inward till each gazed full into the other. This must have been a singular experience, and would make a new and interesting chapter in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

optical psychology ; but to roll the eyes of the soul inward until they see only knowledge of self and knowledge of the knowledge of the self, until infinity is found in the far perspective of this involution, is a yet stranger thing. Many literary novelties utterly impossible before are now easy. Do these psychic states, in themselves utterly unconnected, drift together in shoals by chance, or are they bundled up into personalities by bodily or brain sequences on which we must rely for everything causal? What a vast and almost megalo-maniacal respect for themselves human aggregations of atomic mind states acquire, when it is realized that the whole vast cosmos, even space itself, is essentially and really created by and projected from them as caryatides, bearers of the universe ! How plastic everything, even natural law, seems ! There are as many possible cosmoses as there are combinations and permutations among all its elements, and how far above the old delusion of any absolute truth, duty, law, etc., we have ascended ! How supreme over its base creation, matter, mind becomes ! How near the divine creative energy is each thinking subject ! How dull the souls that labor with matter as if it were ultimate, or with human opinion as if it could be taken seriously !

What is the way out of this charmed circle of agnosticism? Can the professor who has thus shipwrecked his students save them from drowning? Is he able to build up the world again from his acosmic elements? There are, fortunately, many ways of rescue, academic and non-academic ; but, unfortunately, each professor usually has his own private, patent way, and discredits all others. If outside the college walls a few earnest, or even malingering, souls drift toward any such "urposition," they either commit suicide in despair, become cynics or nihilists, take refuge in selfishness, or perhaps throw themselves into the creed of some rather saturated orthodoxy—it may be even Catholicism. Under ordinary circumstances, a vital soul thus flayed knows no rest till it can at least cicatrize ; often it is like a chemical element in a nascent state and combines with substances with which under ordinary conditions it has little affinity.

The epistemological hebamist is not hard and unsympathetic, and is very anxious that his class should not suffer needlessly or long ; but chiefly that they should be saved according to his method. But they must feel themselves completely lost, even if they do not feel that "other refuge have they none." To be sure, a few of the most brilliant American epistemologists in all their own philosophy stop here. They believe in right habituation, in all the practical virtues,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the cultivation of memory, reason, and healthful sentiments; but the above residuum of things, incombustible in the hottest fire of scepticism, they deem the last syllable of human thought. This standpoint favors brilliancy and stimulates paradox, because everything is an open question; and however strenuous and effective their argument, it ends in a collapsing confession that the other side of everything is perhaps, after all, true. It goes with a special proclivity for insoluble questions instead of for those that may be resolved.

But as Dante grappled with the shaggy sides of Satan frozen in the middle of the earth, and turned himself around at the centre of gravity to shoot through to the other side, so the student is told that henceforth he must sift everything through consciousness, and trust no more to tradition, inclination, or instinct, and is thus psychologically stood on his head. Even if the way out is by a *salto mortalis* to a transcendent being, this shooting the chutes must be done as an implication of self-consciousness and with a teleological goal. It is absolute, if not personal, and, in a very choice and select sense, divine thought and purpose in the world that is real and has power to save; and consciousness is sifted for arguments, and construed in conformity, with the interests of this hypothesis. Thought and being have the same author; and their parallelism either converges in him or is itself the finality of a Malebranche. The religious "ways out" are manifold, but they all postulate an analogy made unwarrantably close between belief in the external world and in God, soul, and other theological concepts. Indeed, these latter often have precedence, because they are closer to thought or more reënforced by feeling. A belief in a transcendent world and its occupants is, then, one form of escape.

Another mode of jail delivery for these youthful souls in prison, with a number of variants, is ethical. Not the plain precepts, go to work, do your obvious duties, "look outward not inward," cease this folly of doubt, etc.; but something far more elaborate. This universe is a gigantic self, for Fichte has said it, and the centre of the self is the will. This principle, modified by Schopenhauer, is the master key of the universe, which we cannot rightly understand save by interpreting energy as will. This fadges very well with the Wundt theory of attention and apperception as rudimentary will, and thus by carefully picking one's way through these stages, under competent guidance, the weary mariner makes a landfall at last.

This is a pleasant and stimulating *détour*, and has the great ad-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

vantage of piloting the pilgrim through some of the most interesting and newest thought in the philosophic field. The metaphysical part of it makes a congenial and tasteful historic background for the laboratory material which is unusually rich here; but it has the inevitable effect of implicating what God made much plainer, and it, too, needs all the energy that a desperate struggle for psychic existences can give to get through it. It may claim to be not so much a theory of knowledge as of will; but it is a will theory with many metaphysical implications, addressed chiefly to the gnostic instincts, and might be called essentially sophronistic.

The effects of any drastic course in epistemology, by whatever method, greatly need an attention they have never yet had. Let us consider those who have the distemper in the most thorough and complete form with every prescribed symptom and stage, and who achieve the completest salvation possible. These become the *beati possidentes*, who, like the youthful and bulbous-headed Theætetus, learn to love and thrive on this diet of boiled cobwebs, as Heine calls it. They who have experienced the inner illumination become adepts, expert in the initiation of others. Their first mark is a certain aloofness from the world and life—things are not as they seem; the sense of reality which the vulgar feel has gone; the things others strive for are not worth while. Just as dogmatic assertion tends to weaken the sense of veracity, so to work out by consciousness what our deepest instincts give, both weakens and teaches us distrust of the very best and choicest of all the things of the soul.

These persons can work for and with others, but their thinking is in a different language, and their feeling in a different register. They are fond of challenging or "holding up" the methods or results of both science and common sense, if they have not the Kantian visé. They deal in reasons good and bad for what healthy souls believe by instinct, because a life unexplained is not worth living, and no actions can be virtuous unless judged by knowledge. Everything must be done in, or go through, consciousness, and eternal warfare is waged upon all within us that is *naïve* and spontaneous. Perhaps they are sadly anxious about the logical character of the universe, and ambitious of constructing some new bridge across the chasm which separates thought from being and reality from appearance; or perhaps the world has no substance and seems hollow at the core; and occasionally they may fall a prey to the night terrors of the baffled ontologist. They slowly adjust themselves to live in an altitude

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

so high that there is danger of mental asphyxia, where the view is wide, but where nothing can be seen distinctly for the distance and haze. Although physically they frequent the haunts of men, they are really mahatma living in remote places, prodigies of premature and extreme senescent wisdom.

The great majority, however, do not attain any such degree of esoteric perfection, but live on a lower plane. All the beliefs of childhood and youth are gone, and their illusions exposed. With these the possibility of whole-souled enthusiasm and interest in life is reduced. Their atmosphere has lost its due proportion of oxygen. This is precisely the philosophy of the spirit of *nil admirari* and indifference. Devotion, admiration, praise, faith, world-reforming convictions cannot thrive, but wither, in this air. The mind can criticise, satirize, and parody with great cleverness. It can even crepitate and scintillate over certain eclectic themes, and excel in compilation ; but the creativeness inherent by nature in every adolescent mind is gone, and in its place there is an interesting and fastidious moral if not mental invalidism.

Perhaps Aristotle had such cases in mind when he insisted that no young man should be allowed to study moral philosophy ; and so did Plato, who would flog young men who continued this study too long, although he allowed the citizens of his ideal state to return to it at the age of fifty, after they had been duly seasoned in the world.

I have no space here to characterize adequately the details of this cult. I regard it as an interesting modern edition of the almost world-old tradition or philosopheme of the fall and redemption of man ; the Eleusinian mysteries, the church doctrines of conversion or of many savage rites of initiation, which are psychological variants of the same theme. It is a cult which distinctly has its place ; but, like the others, it is wretchedly inadequate to its great work, because it is a symbol of life itself, and its processes should end only in old age. Its conclusion is the standpoint normal and characteristic to the grand climacteric of senescence. Indeed, life consists in a kind of nautilus growth—an eternally transforming and enlarging of our ideals.

This treatment of the youthful soul is wrong, because it turns the mind inward at a stage which nature designed to be the most objective. Never is there such a hunger and assimilative capacity for all facts and laws of concrete nature and life. Young men would do better to be left far more to the tender mercies of professors in other departments, because in this they are psychically starved; and the re-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sult is what always follows a too impoverished diet, precocious maturity, and senescent cephalization. Sometimes, on the other hand, the effects of starvation in the later stages of mental growth are very analogous to its effects upon maturing larvæ. They are arrested, and the last stages of growth and the final molt, which normally result in the full insect, do not take place. So the professor attempts to step-mother nature and to pick off the last cast; and, of course, the effect is damaging, especially if one gives any credence to the old pedagogic saw that an ounce of heredity is better than a ton of education.

Again this exactly inverts nature's order. She does not pick off the deciduous leaves to make room for the buds. Those who know the true Georgics of the mind diligently foster growth everywhere, devote themselves to positive work, and leave the negative processes of decay to take care of themselves. This is the time of life when the power of the soul is measured not by its capacity to doubt, but by its power to believe. Even superstition or extra belief probably has a great and necessary function here, because it nourishes the life of the feelings and instincts at a time when they are more dominant over the intellect than at any other stage of life. A positive state and habit of mind tending to absorb knowledge to the saturation point is what is wanted. How much one can hold to is a better test of the health and vigor of the soul than how little.

The soul hungers for all the positive knowledge there is, and its new foliage is always crowding off the old. Sentiment and intuition in all their manifoldness now better express the true and full nature of the soul than does the understanding. How successfully can the freshness of life—which we have now the best anthropological reason to maintain touches its highest point in college years—be preserved, and all that we mean by youth be conserved, into old age? This should be the problem—not how the sad wisdom of years can be affected in the early twenties.

The epistemological method and goal are very akin to those of the ancient sophists, although dealing with different subject-matter. In their knowledge-shops appeal was made to the disposition of men, often younger than our college students, to play with ratiocination. It almost seems as though at a certain time the brain-centres, hitherto more or less isolated, began to be knit together by association fibres, so that there is a distinct nascent period for argumentation, and particularly for love of fallacies. This, no doubt, has its place, and if properly cultivated in scholastic disputations does service;

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

but both to aggravate and direct it to themes unbefitting man's estate is the fatal Hubris of the Greek tragedies, which the gods avenge. Point for point, too, these philosophers seem avatars in the modern world of the scholastics of the days of Abelard. Then the question was whether words could express reality, as now whether thought or sense can know it.

I know it will shock some of my colleagues, and even my best and most revered philosophic friends, when I say that, as for me, my teaching shall henceforth assume boldly and squarely that man has a body and even a brain, and that the external world is every whit as real as anything else. As Socrates said of the great sophists, I would rather be refuted by their arguments than to use them. I wish my thinking to be "natural" thinking, and cannot doubt but that there is something in the human soul that knows its own wherever found, by a method which leaves proof far behind. I prefer to invert the Cartesian slogan and say *sum, ergo cogito*, and would adopt Maine de Biran's formula of *volo, ergo sum*, or perhaps even Hobbes', "I count, therefore I am," rather than the old view. I will no longer hark back to Kant, great as he was and high as his place in history must always be, but will look forward to a larger philosophy of the future, which I think this country is destined slowly to evolve.

I believe that most, though not all, students are better if trained to follow men like Fechner, Fouillée, Sergi, or our own Schumann—who, after teaching this theory of knowledge for years, renounced it—and keep out of agnosticism, rather than to get out of it in ways laid down by Kant and all his epigoni, or even those of the subtle, learned, and very ably wrought-out ways devised by Hodgson, Renouvier, Ward, James, Royce, Garman, Münsterberg, and others. I object to treating my science or my consciousness like a St. Martin's stomach by pulling out and examining its content to study the stages of assimilation; and still less can I work in the very narrow limits prescribed for psychology in the over-elaborate classifications and definitions of some of my contemporaries. Wherever life is most intense and reality seems most real, there the student of the inner life should find his theme and seek to be at home.

Psychology, as I hold it, and try to teach and have it taught, rests on a broad basis of general biology. It attempts to impart the largest, richest body of facts possible concerning the instincts and habits of animals, the life and customs of savage, of barbarous races, and of children. It always insists upon the importance for every one

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of a good general knowledge of the history of philosophy, including ethics and logic ; but it teaches the systems sympathetically, rather than critically. It makes large use of the laboratory and of modern studies of the brain, and seeks to apply its results at every practicable point to religion, art, education, history, and every other department of active life. It postulates an expansionist's policy for psychology, and seeks coöperation and contact as widely as possible ; nay, more, it even regards all the great systems of the great thinkers in an objective way and studies their origins ; seeking for them, and for even the epistemological movement itself, a psychological explanation as the ultimate one, regarding everything in all its work from a purely objective, natural-history standpoint.

This view is frankly evolutionary, and holds that whatever nature is we are ; that nature is the truth of all things ; and that whatever does not agree with it is by every token false. As Goethe held as true whatever was fruitful for him, so the really modern psychologist seeks one of his criteria of truth in its profitableness to his senses and its application to education, sociology, art, religion, and life, and does not teach a psychology *versus* life, as a recent book ought to be called. He does not ostentatiously condemn and evict common sense, our national muse, as dear to and as characteristic of us as *Gemüth* to the German or *esprit* to the Frenchman, from his workshop, but welcomes her assimilative processes as modes of thinking the universe in the easiest way as essential to the very existence of a republic, determining everything and making the voice of the people the work of God. He cares little for the old fiddling on the categories, whether the philosopher's lyre be strung with the Aristotelian ten strings or the two of Schopenhauer.

The ultra-epistemologist seems lacking in a quality of mental virility ; his voice is raucous, and we cannot wait for his idle proclamations in pretentious volapuk of what knowledge is, what it is possible to know, what is the nature of mind and actuality, especially if he shows a disposition to challenge or even tie up the work of science till his spurious mortgage is cancelled. Why longer muddle the subjective and objective? Why hypertrophy the self-consciousness we cannot define, and which may often be from its origin less a normal than a remedial function? Is it not better to evolute than to involute ourselves? Must the soul thus encyst itself to metamorphose into a higher type of psychic life? My own answer is ready and decided.

G. Stanley Hall.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

AN UNWRITTEN CHAPTER IN RECENT TARIFF HISTORY.

In May, 1897, the writer was directed by the Secretary of the Treasury to proceed to Washington to "attend a conference of the Senate Finance Committee." This meant that I was to be with the minority party of the Finance Committee as expert during the time the Dingley Bill was under consideration.

As finally passed, the tariff act called for an estimate of the revenue derivable from its provisions. The estimate of $200,000,000 which I submitted as the revenue for 1899, as stated in the "Evening Post" of July 2, 1897, showed a greater amount of revenue than the estimates of other officials. I based my figures on trade action, and on the intrinsic conditions of our manufacturing industries—the only bases on which it is possible to form an estimate that is worth consideration. This estimate of $200,000,000 was practically realized by the imports. The duties collected from imports of merchandise represented in the various schedules amounted to $200,873,429.23, against my estimate of $200,341,869. The table given below shows my various estimates side by side with the duties that were actually collected:

Schedules.	Estimate of Revenue for the Fiscal Year 1898–99.	Actual Revenue of the Year 1898–99.
A. Chemicals, oils, and paints	$6,674,600	$6,461,000
B. Earthenware and glass	8,125,000	8,001,000
C. Metals and manufactures	12,990,000	7,500,000
D. Wood and manufactures	1,650,000	1,669,000
E. Sugar	52,564,000	61,629,000
F. Tobacco	14,322,881	10,627,000
G. Agriculture	9,839,000	12,406,000
H. Spirits, etc.	8,064,000	8,247,000
I. Cotton and manufactures	17,542,000	17,735,000
J. Linen and fibres	7,853,907	10,683,000
K. Wool	13,620,000	3,948,000
K. Woollens	18,475,000	13,270,000
L. Silks	13,935,000	13,506,000
M. Paper, pulp, books	1,443,946	1,374,000
N. Miscellaneous	13,141,520	.....

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

That the estimated revenue was so near to the actual one proves that for merchandise in which our ability for supply is deficient, the demand is fairly constant. The discrepancies do not contradict this. In the "F" and "G" schedules conditions intervened which could not be foreseen. The difference in "F," cigars and tobacco, is accounted for by the Spanish-American and Cuban-Spanish wars, and in "G," by the newly levied duties on tea. In "sugar, "E," an excess importation in 1899 accounts for the greater yield. The heavy importations that preceded the passing of the tariff of 1897 restricted the imports in 1898 so much as to account for the succeeding heavier importations of 1899. In "J," linens, the importations were much heavier than had been anticipated. The increased duties evidently did not diminish the demand. We cannot make linens in this country, though we give some fabrics that name; and since the demand is constant increased duties serve to increase the price to the consumer, or cause the dealer to sell an inferior fabric at the old price.

The metal schedule shows $5,500,000 less than the estimate of $12,990,000. Nearly all of this loss falls to tin plate. As late as 1893 imports in this commodity amounted to $17,630,000. My estimate for 1899 was $7,000,000. The importations were but $2,670,000.

In my reports to the State Department (see Consular Reports Nos. 64 and 97) in 1886 and 1888, I had informed the United States Government, after personal inquiry into corresponding labor fields in the most advanced works of England, Germany, and the United States, that in steel-rail making—in all the branches from the coal and the ore to the finished rail—our expenditure in labor was not higher than in any one of these countries, certain computations to the contrary notwithstanding. Pig iron alone gave a higher rate, as little machinery had then been put in use at the furnaces; but this was fully balanced by lower labor cost in other branches.

This information came in the nature of a surprise at that time; but the phenomenal development of our exports of all the furnace and mill products in iron and steel is but a verification of the data then produced. Tin plate, largely dependent on hand labor, was thought to be a manufacture secure to Wales. But, as shown above, American genius for machine production has enabled us to cope with that subject.

The wool and woollen schedule ("K"), however, shows at first sight an unaccountable falling off; and it is to this item that my comments will be devoted. In 1894, when the so-called Wilson tariff was

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

before the Senate, Secretary Carlisle appointed me to attend the Senate Finance Committee in an expert capacity. The difficulties that surrounded the Committee were greater than in 1897. A contemplated reduction in a tariff always meets the organized opposition of all the beneficiaries of legislation. The crippled and the moribund appeal to the compassion of the legislator whose hand is raised to strike the blow. But the perpetual invalid had no need of fear. The disposition of the Senate was a kindly one. The greater therefore was the necessity to exercise caution in accepting the doleful tales of desolation of homes and destruction of firesides that would follow a lowering of the tariff rates. Besides, proportions had to be maintained.

The cotton manufacturers had prepared a "scientific system," advancing three-tenths of a cent on all cotton yarns per number on singles, and advancing four-tenths of a cent on yarns above singles. This appeared so perfect a system that little opposition was made to it at first, especially as it came so near the French system, which, it was said, worked admirably. The difference lay in this, that the French tariff was based on an average of 10 to 15 per cent on yarns, the American on 50 to 60. The French spinners aim at protection; the American, at a complete monopoly.

In the yarns from American ordinary cotton it was found that the duties would range up to 85 per cent; in Egyptian and Sea Island yarns, the average showed 60 per cent; and in the higher finished yarns, 45 per cent. Duties of this magnitude would, of course, be prohibitive in all but the highest priced yarns. This principle could not be adopted, even by protectionist Democratic Senators. Protection was to be granted on a very liberal basis, yet it was not to duplicate the cost of the duty-free material besides the cost of manufacture. The remarkable tales of labor differences between America and England, imparted to the Committee by manufacturers' delegations, were met by inquiries into the labor cost by the piece. The manufacturers were seldom prepared to answer such questions.

However, the cost of labor in England and the statements from American competing industries were at hand. Special claims were made on behalf of the finer numbers; but these were found to be paid for at rates rather under than above the English rates. In No. 100s, for instance, the differences were 4.85 against 4.86 cents per pound; in 108s, 5.34 against 5.45 cents; in 116s, 5.64 against 6.07 cents; in 120s, 6.10 against 6.38 cents in England. In the numbers below 100s the American rates showed trifling increases toward the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lowest numbers. In weaving, it was found that, in ordinary cotton goods, the rate in America was about 20 per cent under the English cost. The rate per hundred yards of print cloth in Fall River was 36 cents; in England, for the same cloth, it was 44 cents.

That the wool and woollen tariff would be the chief battle-ground was to be expected. The plea of the reformer that the wool tariff was not only a heavy burden upon the consumer, but a tax upon the health and comfort of the poor, was at last to be entertained. Sheep-raising had become displaced by the more profitable employment of land rapidly increasing in value: from the days of Cain and Abel, the shepherd has had to yield to the agriculturist. In 1868 the States east of the Mississippi River and north of Mason and Dixon's line had 28,500,000 sheep; by 1895 they had less than 11,000,000. The States of the Far West, on the contrary, increased their stock from 5,500,000 in 1880 to more than 17,000,000 in 1895.

But for the work of our political shepherds little opposition would have been made to what almost everybody considered a great boon, free wool; wool being a commodity not taxed by any nation except the United States. The wool tariff, with its different gradings, and its mixtures with cotton and shoddy in manufactures, brought upon the statute book a medley of tariff duties, presenting a luxuriant field for litigation lawyers and a source of annoyance to the importer and the appraising officer. With wool free, no excuse was left for graded and pound duties. An ad-valorem rate, progressing from the lower product to the higher, finished one, would have covered all just demands. The manufacturers, however, presented a schedule of mixed weight and ad-valorem duties, graded at different values, which, from the rates proposed, would have acted as follows: Manufactures of wool valued at 25 cents per pound would have paid 56½ per cent; at 35 cents, 46⅓ per cent; at 60 cents, 36 per cent; at a fraction over 60 cents, 45 per cent; at 75 cents, 43 per cent; at 75 cents and a fraction, 51 per cent; at $1 a pound, 45 per cent; at a fraction above $1, 61 per cent; fine dress goods, worth easily $10 a pound, would have paid but 36 per cent.

There could be no reasonable ground upon which to base this system of unequal taxation, whose chief weakness lay in the incentive it offered to undervaluation, by the various dividing lines of values and duties. If goods valued at 60 cents could pass the Customs paying 36 per cent duty, it would not be possible to compete with goods invoiced correctly at 65 cents, as these would pay 43 per cent. Instead

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of an equal ad-valorem rate on cloths and dress goods, a dividing line at the value of 50 cents per pound was adopted. It was to be 40 per cent at or below, and 50 per cent above, that price. The chief obstacles were found later on at this very point.

I shall cite one case in evidence: The chief importations were in cloths at 2*s.* 3*d.* the yard on the basis of the weight of 16 ounces. For every ounce up or down 1½*d.* was added or deducted. The net price, after deducting all allowances and adding dutiable charges, came to 53.20 cents; the duty of 50 per cent added, viz., 26.60, brought this price up to 79.80 cents.

These were goods purchased in large quantities by importers from English houses. To these the American buyer paid a commission of 5 per cent, and half of this commission was made dutiable. The identical goods consigned to American commission houses from manufacturers in England paid no commission, and could be entered at 2½ per cent less than the purchased goods. This would not have sufficed to bring them beneath the 50 per cent line. But by means of declaring a weight slightly different from the actual one, and by invoicing the goods at 2*s.* 2¼*d.*, the goods netted only 48 cents and a fraction of the pound value, which, with 40 per cent duty added, viz., 19.20, made the goods come to but 67.20 cents. Timely discovery of this and similar attempts prevented the importation of very large consignments. Such orders had to be cancelled, as under the 50 per cent duty the goods could not be disposed of against the regular importing houses of standing.

The first step in worsted manufacturing, after the clean wool has been carded, is the combing of the wool; this, as well as much of the preparatory manipulation, being done by automatic machinery. Justice to those smaller manufacturers who are compelled to buy their yarn, and to the yarn-maker who is compelled to buy his combings, demanded that duties should be imposed in proportion to the labor involved. But this just proposition met with fierce opposition.

In 1888 (see Consular Report No. 95) I had investigated the manufacture of worsteds in England and in America, and had based my comparisons on identical numbers and qualities of cloths. Only specifically defined objects can serve for comparison, as they leave no room for the doubts arising from the vagueness of averages and percentages. The difference between England and America in the cost of turning fine wool into combings was scarcely 2 cents. To turn these tops into a yarn of twofold 40s cost 4 cents in Bradford;

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in a mill near Philadelphia where they used Ohio XX wool the labor cost was 4.92 cents.[1]

The Wilson bill had proposed on fine wool tops 30 per cent and on corresponding yarns 35 per cent, while on cloth and dress goods the duty was made 40 per cent. The result would have been that tops made of free wool at a labor cost of 5 cents, and of a foreign value of 36 cents, would have paid 10.80 cents duty. Yarn made of free wool costing in labor 9.50 cents, and of a foreign value of 50 cents, would have paid 17.50 cents duty ; and the cloth made of this yarn, and importable at, let us say 65 cents, would have paid 26 cents duty. This might have been ample, perhaps, for the maker from the wool ; but those compelled to buy the yarn would have had but 8.50 cents of duty to protect them in a labor cost of perhaps 25 cents. Yarn-makers would have enjoyed the full protection on the wool (made free) as well as on the labor ; but the cloth-maker would have had only the protection on the difference between the cost of the yarn and the cost of the cloth.

The final arrangement was 20 per cent on tops, 40 per cent on yarns, and 50 per cent on the corresponding class of cloth. On the above quoted basis of prices this made the duties stand as follows : Tops, protection 7.20 cents ; yarns, 20 cents ; and cloth, 32.50 cents, and, less duty on yarn, if purchased, 12.50 cents. The duties were somewhat better arranged than by the Wilson bill, but with 40 per cent duty on yarn the corporations had carried their point to the virtual exclusion of the smaller manufacturers. It had been the contention of reformers that the heavy duties at the base of production prevented the specialization of industries, the spreading out into the finer manufacturing branches. This shows clearly enough the causes at work which prevent a development of this sort.

To make an exact comparison on equal points with English cost is a difficult matter ; the methods being so essentially different. The American mill covers the entire industry. The wool enters as shorn from the sheep, and leaves the mill door in the shape of the finished cloth. In England, and on the Continent of Europe as well, the cloth-maker buys his yarns, weaves the cloth, and sends the latter to the dyer, who dyes and finishes it. The spinning-mill, as a rule,

[1] The figures previously collected were corroborated by an investigation made by myself in Eastern mills, in June, 1894, in regard to the cost of labor then existing. This investigation was undertaken, by direction of the Secretary of the Treasury, for the Chairman of the Senate Finance Committee.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

does only the yarn-making part. The spinner either buys in the open market the combed wool, the tops—as they are graded in kinds and numbers—or he selects his wool and sends it to the comber. The wool-comber usually does every part of the work, from the sorting to the scouring and combing. Each of the steps in manufacture is in the hands of competent, and financially responsible, parties. The prevention of wastage is an especial advantage of the English system. It has been claimed that the waste in American mills is sufficiently large to cover a very satisfactory profit at the rate of English manufacture.

Excessively high rates of duty made the industries dependent on them persevere in negligent ways until, driven by fierce competition at home, far-seeing minds went diligently to work to stop the leakages and introduce improvements; thus paving the way to the industrial advance we see developing before our eyes. The chief obstacle to a lowering of duties has always been the claim of our higher rate of wages. But if reduced to the piece rate these differences were not formidable, and frequently showed a lower labor cost, especially in industries where we had introduced superior working methods.

In the worsted industry it cannot be said that this was the case. In the spinning-mills, however, no great differences could arise in those equipped with modern appliances. In weaving, the difference in cost was greater. A variety of accounts from England—sent by manufacturers, by merchants having their weaving done in commission weaving-mills, and by the United States Consul—showed the cost of turning yarn into a particular class of cloth to be a trifle under five cents. A profit is contained in this price for the maker, which, according to a manufacturer shipping direct to the United States, who had an interest in proving his ability to produce at low cost, appears to be about ¾ cents per yard. The cloth in question was one on which the duty, under the tariff of 1894, at 50 per cent, amounted to 27 cents the yard. From accounts received, which I need not give in detail here, it became evident that a doubling of the cost just stated (*i.e.*, 4 cents) would have well covered the actually existing differences in labor between England and America for turning yarn into cloth of this kind.

Such claim could not, however, be made in the dyeing—an important part in the cost. In England no mill in this line has its dye-house. The work is all done by commission dyers. The price charged

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for the particular cloth I have in mind was, according to direct information, 12*s.* 6*d.* ($3.04) per piece of 60 yards, which is 5 cents per yard. American mills having their own dye-houses could not, and in fact did not, claim that they were unable to meet this price. From these statements the reader will admit that ample protection was given the industries of the country in the tariff of 1894.

In that year, for the first time in the history of American manufacture, wool of every kind was made free. For the first time the American manufacturer was given an even start with Europeans competing for his home market. For the first time he was told to go where he chose, select his staples where they were grown, and bring them into his mill to try to make what his people desired. He was given four months of extra time to import free wool before goods were permitted to enter under the reduced tariff.

The importation of wool that followed showed how the manufacturers appreciated the privilege thus given to them. In the ten remaining months of the fiscal year 1894–95, under the new tariff, there were imported 82,000,000 lbs. of clothing wool (fine wool), 15,750,000 lbs. of combing wool, and 97,000,000 lbs. of carpet wool. Carpet wool is not produced in this country, and must be imported under all circumstances. The trend of things will be seen from the statement that the average imports of fine clothing wool for the preceding four years of the McKinley tariff had been 36,000,000 lbs., and of combing wool, 5,000,000 lbs. But the 1894–95 importations were only the beginning of the avalanche. In 1896 the importations were 117,250,000 lbs. of Class I. (clothing wool), and 15,750,000 lbs. of Class II. (combing wool); and in 1897, the last year of the free-wool tariff, there were imported 200,750,000 lbs. of Class I., and 38,000,000 lbs. of Class II.

The six months from January 1 to June 30, 1897, were under the shadow of the Dingley Bill; and the wool importations covered by that period may be looked upon as speculative. But that the wools for 1895 and 1896 were imported for immediate use in the mills admits of no doubt. With the beginning of the calendar year 1895, the gates were opened for the importation of woollens under the new tariff. The imports were heavy, of course, but by no means so heavy as the outcry raised by the manufacturers made the public believe they were. The ruin worked by the "free-trade tariff," as they called the tariff that granted free wool and 50 per cent protection, we were told was appalling. Of course, if the year 1896 is compared

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with 1894 a very large increase is shown. But the year 1894, anticipating the lower tariff, brought very few goods from Europe, and an increased supply was necessary to balance the dearth thus caused. Counting 1894 with 1895 and 1896, the aggregate shows no increase over the three years preceding. The excess in bulk, of which much has been made by trade papers, which seem to have expressed the views of their patrons rather than their own, is largely illusory; *i.e.*, if we eliminate the goods of lower value which had been excluded from the list by former prohibitive tariffs.

The large importations running all through the eighties, as seen below,[1] were due chiefly to the fact that a great change in manufacturing had taken place. The improvement in combing machinery, and the development in wool-raising at the antipodes, had built up a new industry abroad. The fine staple—though not of the length of the old English breeds, which had supplied the combing wools in former times—could now be used advantageously in the combs; and it produced a soft strand from which were made the fabrics that loaded our docks with cases from England, Germany, and France.

Owing, perhaps, to his ignorance of the merits of these wools, the American manufacturer was slow in adapting himself to the new conditions. He was expert in the manufacture of flannels, cotton warp, shoddy and wool goods, and a variety of lower-grade woollens where he had the field all to himself. He made the accustomed use of it. After clogging the channels of trade, the auction-room relieved the tension of his own creation. In cassimeres, cheviots, etc., he held the trade exceedingly well in hand. But the demand for these was declining under a new demand, fostered largely by the

[1] VALUES OF IMPORTATIONS OF MANUFACTURES OF WOOL (EXCLUSIVE OF YARNS, TOPS, SHODDY, AND RAGS), IN TARIFF PERIODS FROM 1884 TO 1896.

	Act of 1883.		Act of 1890.	Act of 1894.
	1884-86.	1887-90.	1891-93.	1895-96.
Aggregate value.....$	116,496,474	192,704,571	114,663,890	86,590,362
Average value per year.....$	38,832,158	48,176,143	38,220,293	43,295,181
Populations in millions.....	56.	61.	67.	71.
Value per capita.....$	0.69	0.79	0.57	0.61
Less cloths, etc., previously not importable $	.....	.....	.....	38,000,000
Value per capita.....$	.....	.....	.....	0.53
Cloths, aggregate value.....$	32,755,194	47,110,960	39,944,683	38,184,697
Cloths, average.....$	10,918,084	11,777,240	13,314,227	19,092,348
Cloths previously not importable.....$	.....	.....	.....	32,584,000
Average previously not importable.....$	.....	.....	.....	16,292,000
Average per capita.....$	0.195	0.193	0.20	0.23

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

softer and lighter fabrics producible from the wools from the Southern Hemisphere, which, by the aid of new mechanical devices, had given such an impetus to Saxon and Yorkshire industry. The backwardness of American mill development alone explains the conditions demonstrable from this table. These facts have not been explained before, but deserve to be made clear, as they furnish the necessary key to the situation.

The free admission of the requisite wools soon made a change. As early as the spring of 1896 the importers of worsteds found that they could not meet the competition of American manufacturers any longer. They were being undersold, driven out of the market, which, under the acts of 1883 and 1890, had furnished an even and constant demand for English goods. During the calendar year 1895, the first twelvemonth of the Wilson tariff for woollens, the imports from England into the port of New York amounted to $13,534,354 of cloths falling under the higher duties. In the months of January and February, 1896, there was practically no decline. From then to the end of the year the decline was rapid. In September and October, 1896, the imports were $331,386, against $2,086,762 for the corresponding months of 1895. In the four months of the season ending with December, 1896, the totals were $800,350, against the sum of $4,028,684 during the same period of 1895.

The advocates of a free-wool tariff have found ample vindication in these facts, which unfortunately for their cause were generally unknown. The shoddy-goods manufacturer was seriously hurt. He claimed foreign competition was the cause. But the goods which he had been in the habit of making were not those that came over in quantities. The real cause of suffering of the shoddy-goods maker was free wool. A suit of clothing of all-wool cloth could be sold at retail at a price which formerly would scarcely have bought one of the outfits which, at the edges, and in the bags at the elbows and the knees, show the nature of the material out of which they are made, and to which the name of wool can be extended only by courtesy. As manufacturers of shoddy goods use very little genuine wool, the removal of the so-called compensatory duty of 33 cents per pound on imported cloth took away an absurd rate of protection—a protection which at a much lower figure would have given undisputed possession of the trade. The worsted manufacturers expected to exclude all foreign imports of goods which they had now learned to manufacture. In this, a reimposition of the wool tariff would help them. They

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

would enjoy an extra protection in the compensatory duties. They would receive 44 cents on the pound of imported cloth as protection, while Botany wool shrinks only about 50 per cent in scouring, and crossbred wools shrink even less. It takes but two pounds and a half of greasy Australian, and less than two pounds of the crossbred wools, to make a pound of cloth. Hence they would enjoy a protective tariff on the wool not consumed in manufacturing, besides the ad-valorem of 50 per cent.

Many sails of hope were spread on the passing of the Dingley tariff. The bill passed into law. But the sailing was not as free as had been expected, and plenty of snags were met in the current. The six months from January to the end of June were not neglected by importers. The importations of cloths from England into New York during that time were, in the higher grade of goods, $4,762,668, and from all other countries, in round numbers, $1,200,000. In the lower-rated goods, $2,447,120 were brought from England, and $986,000 from all other countries. The total imports for the whole country in all classes of cloths for these six months were $11,660,000, which is but $2,200,000 more than the imports of the port of New York.

Still, in order to "fill the American market with immense stocks," the European centres of production, where goods are not piled up in expectation, but are produced only on *bona-fide* orders, were entirely cleared out of all available stock. But these stocks, along with other surplus importations that had found slower sale than anticipated, proved for a long time a thorn in the flesh. Neither the manufacturer nor the importer could reap the expected fruit. The prices of American goods set the pace. Up to last spring, the prices of worsted and woollens were, with few short-lived spurts of improvement, barely above the average of prices of the spring of 1896. If the price of wool is considered it is doubtful whether the net result was as advantageous. Immense quantities of raw wool had been imported by manufacturers, which they owned at free-trade prices. But American wools used for mixing with Botany, and other Southern, wools were higher. American wool on the scoured basis had been worth only 28 to 30 cents; it was now worth 37.50 cents. The foreign wools were not imported by manufacturers only, but also by speculators. The pressure soon came from the holders of these wools. Banks that had advanced on them asked for the return of loans. The use of cotton and shoddy in the place of wool, as a consequence of the existing high tariffs, was not without its effect.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

All through this time of depression in American wool industries the English mills showed remarkable prosperity. The anomaly arose that wool, becoming scarce the world over, under the effect of droughts in Australia and an active demand at home, rose in price in England under free trade, and was low enough in America, under a protective rate of 11 cents, to enable the United States to reëxport not alone a considerable quantity of foreign wool, but to ship a good deal of domestic wool to England. No less than 3,500,000 lbs. of American wool and 13,500,000 lbs. of foreign wool were shipped in the year 1899.

Excepting in carpet wools, importations stopped with the enactment of the Dingley tariff. The stocks on hand at the time, along with the annual growth, had to serve to supply the mills. The domestic breeds have increased but little since 1896. The wool clip for 1898 was 266,000,000 lbs. and for 1896, 265,000,000 lbs.

I have made a computation of the wool consumption of Germany in 1885 and in 1898. I took the net imports of wool, and added the imports of half manufactures, cloths, etc., multiplying the former by 2 and the latter by $2\frac{1}{2}$ to make them equal to raw wool in pounds. To the sum thus obtained I added the domestic wools, and from this total I deducted the exports of manufactures of wool similarly computed. I obtained the following net results :

	Lbs.	Population.	Consumption per Capita.
Home consumption of wool in 1885.....	240,618,000	46,700,000	5.36 lbs.
Consumption in 1898	368,983,000	54,500,000	6.59 lbs.

If the same basis of computation is adopted for America, a comparison of 1885 and 1899 will show a most astonishing decline. The former year gives 9 lbs., the latter but 5 lbs., as the per capita consumption. But this would not give a fair presentation of the case, as the surplus importations of 1897 went into consumption in the years following. I have, therefore, tabulated the wool and woollens going into consumption according to tariff periods, and averaged the yearly consumption under their respective headings. At the time of writing, the concluding year of the last period—1897 to 1900—has still three months to run. For these I have estimated the importations on the basis of the months for which the figures are known.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The figures are as the table annexed will show :

STATEMENT OF POUNDS OF WOOL CONSUMED IN THE UNITED STATES (INCLUSIVE OF MANUFACTURES OF FOREIGN ORIGIN REDUCED TO RAW WOOL) UNDER VARIOUS TARIFF ACTS FROM 1884 TO 1900. (IN MILLIONS AND THEIR DECIMALS.)

	Act of 1883.		Act of 1890.	Act of 1894.	Act of 1897.	
	1884–86.	1887–90.	1891–94.	1895–96.	1897–1900.	1900.
	3 years.	4 years.	4 years.	2 years.	4 years.	1 yr.
Domestic wool	909.8	1,095.	1,180.3	571.	1,080.5	300.
Imported wool	266.1	449.5	505.5	428.5	686.2	135.
Of which carpet wools	190.	341.	348.5	198.	360.3	100.
Yarns, tops, noils	12.5	36.6	7.4	9.3	7.6	.....
At rate of 2¼ lbs.	29.5	82.3	16.6	20.9	17.1	.....
Rags, wastes, shoddy	.....	.....	.....	29.3	44.3	.....
Cloths	26.6	44.	51.6	60.7	42.8	5.5
At rate of 2½ lbs.	66.5	110.	129.	152.	107.1	13.5
All other manufactures estimated on value	75.	110.	85.	64.	74.9	11.5
At rate of 2½ lbs	138.7	275.4	212.5	160.	187.	28.8
Total lbs. of wool	1,460.6	2,012.2	2,043.9	1,361.7	2,122.2	477.3
Less carpet wools	1,270.6	1,671.2	1,695.4	1,163.7	1,761.9	377.3
Average per year	487.8	503.	511.	680.8	530.5	477.3
Average less carpet wool	423.5	417.7	423.9	581.8	440.5	377.3
Population in millions	56.	61.	67.	71.	75.	78.
Per capita consumption, lbs.	8.7	8.25	7.6	9.6	7.07	6.
Per capita less carpet wools	7.55	6.85	6.3	8.2	5.9	4.8

The year 1900, feeding on its own resources, would give but 6 lbs. of per capita consumption. The manufactures of wool of foreign origin, which have been added to the wool consumption of the period 1897–1900, were certainly absorbed before the beginning of the fiscal year 1900. If we deduct carpet wools, the showing is still more unfavorable to the would-be consumer of wool for clothing purposes. The first period then shows 7.55 lbs.; the second, 6.85 lbs.; the third, 6.3 lbs.; the fourth, 8.2 lbs.; and the fifth, the Dingley tariff period, 5.9 lbs. The year 1900 shows but 4.8 lbs. Comparing this statement with that of Germany, where the carpet industry has had small development, we find that Germany has actually forged considerably ahead of the great Republic in the pounds of wool consumed in the clothing of its inhabitants.

The stuff produced by our mills under these present conditions is a discredit to a civilized country. The wage-earning classes are asked

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to wear so-called woollen goods, made of about 25 per cent of wool, the balance cotton and shoddy, and pay higher prices for these compounds in 1900 than they paid for first-class all-wool articles under the Wilson tariff.

The supplanting of wool by cotton for purposes of dress and clothing is something enormous. We all know what this means in a country subject to such rapid changes of temperature as is ours. You may mercerize, glue, or starch cotton, to give it a shining face, but it will still be cotton. The material obtained by skilful manipulation may serve well as substitutes, but it will, by its bulk and weight, be a drag on the person who wears it. You may rough up the face to give the fabric the appearance of wool, and put ever so deceptive a name on the label; but in the wear it will not deceive. By the extent which these substitutions have assumed along with the manufacture of "worsteds," chiefly cotton, an entirely new departure in the economy of our people, is explained the phenomenon that our wool stocks are not increased by importations and still satisfy the demand. The average for the four years ending with 1900 even shows a decided step backward, and brings our status to the one occupied by Germany in 1885. In this manner the trade, with unerring scent, chronicles the protest of the people against the rise of prices decreed by the Dingley tariff.

JACOB SCHOENHOF.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

TEACHING IN HIGH SCHOOLS AS A LIFE OCCUPATION FOR MEN.

In looking forward to a life work, one is bound to ask oneself two questions: (1) "What service shall I be able to render to others through this employment?" and (2) "What will this employment do for me?" Nor does the second question spring necessarily from a purely selfish motive. An employment that tends to stunt a man physically, intellectually, spiritually, or socially is not apt to be the employment in which he will find his greatest field of usefulness. It is the purpose of this paper to apply these two questions to the vocation of the high-school teacher, and to see whether the opportunities and rewards of the profession are sufficient to attract to it, as a life work, a man who possesses qualities that are likely to bring him success in other professions or in business.

Applying to the profession the first question, the opportunity for service that the position of the high-school teacher affords is apparent at a glance. Philosophers, educators, and the common experience of educated people agree as to the vital significance of the years that are spent in the high school or academy. By some it is designated as the period of a new birth, the period of the dawning of self-consciousness, the time when the child first really begins to know itself; by others, as a period fruitful in higher aspirations, when a new world begins to unfold itself and new ideals take root in the soul; or it may be distinguished as the period during which reason makes its most determined fight against credulity, when youth begins to put away childish things and to hold fast to what it thinks it has proved; and, finally, it may be described as a period when impulses tend most rapidly to become habits, and habits to crystallize into character. At this time in one's life, then, when the plastic nature of childhood is hardening into the fixed character of manhood and womanhood, when every influence that touches it is apt to leave a deep and lasting impression, how important it is that it should be moulded only by master hands! To shape the lives of young people during these years—what an opportunity! what a re-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sponsibility! No calling can surpass it in importance, and few callings can equal it in its opportunities for good or for ill. Viewed from this standpoint alone, the position of teacher in the high schools of a great city is undoubtedly worthy of the life work of any one, and ought to command and retain the services of the most capable men and women that the country can produce.

Why is it, then, that each year sees many of our most efficient and earnest teachers stepping out into other lines of activity? Why is it that, of those who remain and expect to remain in school work, so many are looking out with eager anticipation for chances to become principals, superintendents, or college instructors? An explanation of these facts demands an answer to our second question, "What does the position do for the teacher?"

There are at least three reasons why the position is often regarded by men of energy and ability as unsuitable for their life work.

In the first place, it does not command from the public the respect that attends other positions which call for no more in the way of preparation, ability, energy, and character. It may be said that this is a fault largely of the teachers themselves, that an occupation is judged in the long run by the kind of people who engage in it. Undoubtedly, there is truth in this statement; but due emphasis ought to be laid in this case on the qualification "in the long run." To understand the attitude of the public mind toward its high-school teachers, it is necessary to recall, briefly, the history of our public-school system, and to trace a little more fully the evolution of the public-school pedagogue.

The public high school, as we find it to-day, grew up from the graded school, which, in its turn, sprang from the old-fashioned district school. From the standpoint of place, then, it is at present the head of the public-school system. From the standpoint of time, however, it is the lineal descendant of the graded and the district schools, and consequently has inherited the nature of those schools. As might be expected, with their virtues it has also inherited some of their faults. It must expect to be judged, too, by the character of those ancestors, and to be the victim of many of the prejudices that have existed against them. If, now, we turn our attention to the public-school pedagogue, he furnishes us an illustration of evolution almost as striking as that of the human race itself. The difference between the Squeers type of schoolmaster, common not more than fifty years ago, and the highest type of teacher to be found

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in the schoolroom to-day, is enormous. In the past, it is true, noble souls were to be found who were wearing out their lives in the cause of popular education, but their number was small, and our pedagogical ancestry as a whole is not one that we can contemplate with feelings of unmixed pride.

View the procession: first, simple but well-meaning persons, often with more of the missionary spirit than of education; then, objects of pity and charity, persons hired to keep school because they were not fit to do anything else; then, for the summer months, young girls scarcely in their teens, and for the "winter school" a race of farmer-teachers, fellows who spent eight months of the year cultivating the soil and four months pretending to cultivate brains; then, tramp teachers, young men who wished to earn a little money on their way to other occupations, and young maidens who sought to bridge over a few years profitably between the time of their high-school days and the period of matrimonial cares. Is it strange that the profession of teaching, except in colleges and universities, has not, as yet, gained a high place in the esteem of men?

Another reason why the position does not appear to offer to men an adequate life work lies in the fact that the high-school teacher is often hampered and cramped in his proper field of usefulness by the powers above him. By those ordained to pass judgment on his work he is too often regarded as having only two functions in life: first, to cover a stated number of pages of a stated text-book in a stated time with any given class, without regard to its size, character, ability, or previous condition of servitude; and second, to follow with unquestioning obedience, and to compel all pupils who come under his eye to follow with the same kind of obedience, a system of rules devised to reduce to the regularity of clock-work all motion in and about the school premises. On these two commandments, in many schools, hang all the present success and all the future prospects of the teacher. In dealing with his faculty, a college president usually recognizes the fact that he is dealing with full-grown men and women, who are often his equals in everything save position. Within his proper sphere, the college or university instructor is left free to work out his own salvation. He is selected for that purpose; and the presiding officer usually understands that it is not his place to be meddling with details. The college president also recognizes the fact that, in planning for the interests of the institution over which he presides, he needs the advice of his corps of teachers, as well as their support.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But in the high school it is not always so. Between the principal and the teacher there is often a great gulf fixed. He is pleased to allude to his teachers frequently as his subordinates, if not as his inferiors. To his mind, teachers are not independent human beings employed to instil into the lives of the boys and girls with whom they are brought into touch something of their own character and their own thought. They are only his instruments, to be used by him to stamp upon the minds of the rising generation an adequate knowledge of his attainments and of his importance. This is too often the attitude of superintendents and principals toward their teachers. It is true that, before we criticise them too severely, we should take account of the material they have often been obliged to use. We should remember that between them and their teachers there has frequently been a difference—not in position alone, but also, and to a marked extent, in age, ability, experience, and attainments. Nor is the past tense alone quite adequate to the statement of this truth. This fact may partially justify the attitude of many superintendents and principals; yet too often the teacher is kept needlessly in a position of partial or total eclipse. He can hardly be blamed, therefore, if he sometimes feels longings to break away from that centripetal force that holds him in too narrow an orbit, and to swing out where he can shine as an independent star, if only of the sixth magnitude.

The third reason why men cannot afford to enter the vocation with the expectation of following it as their life work is found in the inadequate salaries attached to the position. An analysis of the nature of the service that any man can render to his fellows reveals two kinds. He can make himself useful to those around him by ministering to those desires that are already clamoring for satisfaction. For service of this nature he will usually be able to command an equivalent in this world's goods. It has a market value. Or, on the other hand, he may sacrifice his time and energies in an attempt to awaken in the souls of his fellow-beings new and higher desires. The immediate reward for such service is apt to be only derision and persecution. Human nature rebels against paying good money for being reminded of the fact that it is living on too low a plane. In general, therefore, men enter those callings that are of a missionary nature without any expectation of receiving for their services adequate compensation, and often with little prospect of securing even the means of a decent subsistence. They know that the reward of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

martyr is not in this world, and that the services of the reformer are seldom valued correctly by his own generation.

Speaking of salaries, we venture to assume that in large cities, at least, high-school teachers are not engaged in missionary work. We assume that the inhabitants of those cities are already awake to the advantages of a high-school education for their children, and that they are able to pay for those advantages. What, then, should determine the salary of the high-school teacher? Should it be an equivalent for service rendered, fixed on a business basis—an amount that he would have been able to command for his services had he engaged in another occupation? Or should the amount of his compensation be determined by the standard of living appropriate to his position and needs? Weighed in the balance against either standard, the high-school teacher's salary will be found wanting.

Chicago furnishes us with a peculiarly good example for study and comparison. The averages of the maximum and minimum salaries paid by thirty of the largest cities in the United States to their high-school teachers are $1,991 and $869, respectively. These averages are very nearly the same as the maximum and minimum sums paid in Chicago. In that city the pay of high-school teachers ranges from $850 to $2,000, less the 1 per cent deducted to maintain a pension fund for such aged teachers as the board thinks fit to retire, and the frequent cuts said to be made necessary by inadequate appropriations for the high-school fund. The highest salary that any teacher receives ranges from $1,880, in years of famine, to $1,980, in years of plenty. Few can hope to reach this summit before a ripe old age overtakes them; many cannot expect to reach it at all.

The candidate, just from the university, starts with $850. He is not a green stripling, for the examination requirements call not only for a college training, but for specialized university work in some particular field. He can, therefore, hardly hope to begin his career as a high-school teacher in Chicago much before he is twenty-five years old. Having started at $850, less the 1 per cent, he advances by easy stages toward the maximum, $1,980. If he ascended this ladder to affluence one step each year it would take him thirteen years to reach the top. Under the most favorable conditions, then, he would be at least thirty-eight years old before he could experience the exquisite pleasure of drawing the munificent sum of $1,980 as his annual stipend. But he does not ascend steadily. There are two big gaps in the ladder over which no one can hope to pass,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

except by friendly assistance from the school board in the way of special dispensations. As there are always a great many waiting such, and only a few can receive them at a time, the teacher is often blocked at these points for several years. In off years, too, he remains at a standstill wherever he may be, and occasionally he is shaken down by the fierce financial tempests that rage over his head.

A few comparatively young men, it is true, are now drawing the maximum salary ; but they began service in the city before the present system was adopted. Under the schedule that exists now, few can hope to reach the enviable limit in time to be able to enjoy it long. But, as $1,980 marks the goal in Chicago, and $1,991 the average goal for thirty of the largest cities in the United States, these figures should be taken as the basis of any comparison. Place these amounts over against the maximum compensation that a man may confidently expect if he is successful in business, in law, in medicine, or in the pulpit. Compare them with the salaries received by many men employed by individual firms or private corporations, or with those attached to official positions, in city, county, State, or nation. How they dwindle away into pitiful insignificance !

What wonder that in an atmosphere charged with the commercial spirit, in which intellectual strength is apt to be measured by its power to get gold or real estate, what wonder that in such an atmosphere the full-grown man who continues to toil in the schoolroom with no hope of any material compensation beyond $1,980 a year, and often without much prospect of getting all of that, comes to be regarded by successful men in other occupations with a feeling akin to pity, and treated by them, when noticed at all, with an air that savors of patronage ! What wonder that young men with ability and ambition, if advised to adopt teaching as a life occupation, turn upon their advisers a look that reflects distrust as to their mental condition, or that proud parents, with a regard for the future social position of their daughter, implore her to accept as her life companion any one before a poor pedagogue !

A compensation fixed upon a business basis takes account of several factors ; the most important among them being the responsibility connected with the work, the preparation required for it, and the nature of the work itself. The responsibility connected with the work of teaching in high schools has already been touched upon. "Man-making," says one of our great thinkers, "is the most divine of all arts." Let no one undertake it, then, thoughtlessly or heed-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lessly. Botch-work in teaching is difficult to detect at once ; it can be covered up more easily than botch-work in any other business. But its bad effects are sure to appear sooner or later in stunted intellects, wrecked ambitions, and stranded lives. By those only who are closely associated with the teacher in his work is the responsibility likely to be fully appreciated. Some time ago "The Journal of Education" published from school superintendents all over the country replies to the question, "What should the assistant be, and what qualities should he possess?" Strength of character, decision, and good judgment ; sound health, great ambition, and willingness to work ; high scholarship, intelligence, a knowledge of methods and principles of education, and executive ability ; honesty, honor, zeal, and loyalty—these are a few of the qualifications, as specified by judges, that the high-school teacher ought to possess. Does any occupation demand more?

In the matter of specific preparation the profession is becoming equally exacting. Nearly every progressive city is saying to-day to its applicants for high-school positions, "None but college graduates wanted here ;" while some places expect in addition special pedagogical study, several years' experience, or a year or more of university training. In Chicago we find the following requirements : "All candidates will be examined in four subjects, of which one will be a major. The scope of the examination in the major will be included in a university course of study where the subject has been made a specialty by the candidate. The scope of the minors will be covered by the work generally done in a college course." That this is not printed just for appearance is proved by the fact that of all who have tried the examinations during the past two years about 70 per cent have failed. What law school, medical college, or theological seminary ever turned down 70 per cent of the persons seeking admission to one of these professions through its doors?

Nor is the nature of the work itself less exacting. To be sure, only five or six hours are usually spent in the schoolroom, but they are hours of constant strain ; and, when the work is properly done, it calls for many additional hours spent in general and special preparation. Nor are the vacations and Saturdays that fall to the lot of teachers—making them objects of envy to busy men in other pursuits—consumed by progressive instructors as periods of Elysian repose. Volumes of literature pertaining to their work have to be read ; hundreds of facts are to be collected and digested ; social de-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mands and home duties, which have been thrust aside during the busy days of the week and the busy weeks of the term, call for attention. Verily, the teacher is not the person of leisure that he sometimes appears to be. If all the hours that he works are summed up, the total will not fall short of those spent in other occupations.

But if it be true that the work of the high-school teacher calls for as much in the way of personal character, ability, special preparation, and energy, as any other of the so-called professions, why is it that its compensation is so much less? First, because the responsibilities of the position, and, therefore, the personal qualities that it should demand, have been so dimly recognized by the general public. Cheap teaching does not result directly in financial loss. That is the reason why it has been tolerated so long, and that is also why the occupation has always been crowded with incompetents and crushed down by those seeking to use it only as a stepping-stone to some other employment. But enlightened society is beginning to awaken to the seriousness of the work. It is busy now putting up high fences to keep out the undesirable and inefficient; it has yet to learn that it must put something attractive on the inside to tempt the strong and the capable to climb over. Few self-respecting, competent men are likely to pursue eagerly, as a life work, any calling whose steady diet is poverty, and whose end is pauperism or a pension. But the chief reason why the teacher does not receive for his services as large material rewards as his efforts would be likely to bring in other lines of enterprise lies in the fact that he is not engaged in a money-making business. His services, therefore, can never be measured by dollars. It is impossible, upon any known business basis, to determine just how much he is worth.

If, then, in intelligent and well-to-do communities, it is neither fitting to put the compensation of the teacher on the missionary basis, nor possible to compute it on a known business basis, giving full market value for service rendered, one method only is left for determining his salary. It ought to be such an amount as will enable him to do his work efficiently, to maintain a standard of living suitable to his position, and to make reasonable provision for that time of life when few men can work. To do these things it is neither proper nor right that his wife should be obliged to take in washing or boarders, that his children should be compelled to go out to work early in life, or that he himself should be forced to engage constantly in other occupations to piece out his inadequate income as a teacher. Yet such

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

are the conditions that now prevail everywhere among high-school teachers with families depending upon them. To provide properly for his wife and children, to maintain them decently in the social position to which their education and tastes usually adapt them, and to maintain himself respectably in those circles where he is called to move, and where he ought to have an influence, the high-school teacher is forced to seek employment outside of his regular work. Quite commonly we hear of him tutoring, hearing private classes, or teaching in night schools; sometimes he engages in so-called literary work, or in business; while occasionally he is to be found, outside of school hours, as a consulting engineer, a practising lawyer, or a fully equipped physician.

Some of these pursuits, if they are engaged in to a moderate extent, may contribute strength to the work of a teacher, and all are certainly legitimate, laudable enterprises for the right persons. But no man can serve two masters; for either he will hate the one and love the other, or in time he will leave the one and hold to the other. Any occupation that rivals in its interests the business of teaching, from the practice of law down to the practice of writing bad text-books just for the money there is in them, tends to destroy the efficiency of the teacher. It steals the time that legitimately belongs to the library, the laboratory, or the family; it robs the community of services that the teacher ought to be able and willing to give to it freely; it degrades and belittles the life of the teacher by compelling him every time he touches society in a useful capacity to calculate how much gold he will be likely to rub off. The motive of economy, alone, ought to lead every wise school board to pay its teachers salaries that are adequate to a suitable standard of living, and then to insist that they should not enter any other regular employment, as a gainful occupation, while connected with the schools.

But what is a suitable standard of living for high-school teachers, and what income is necessary to permit of this standard? It is impossible, of course, to give exact answers to these questions. It ought not, however, to be impossible to arrive at conclusions that can be generally accepted. It is certain that the high-school teacher cannot expect an income that will permit him to live on the scale of those who possess large wealth. It is equally evident that he cannot hope to get along and do his best work on wages that are commonly paid to unskilled laborers, artisans, clerks, stenographers, or bookkeepers. Leaving out of account the large expenditures of time and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

money involved in the preparation for his work, the current demands on his purse and time are too great. It is written that man cannot live by bread alone, and this is doubly true of the teacher. Growth—intellectual, spiritual, and social—must be the prevailing condition of his life. But growth means nourishment, and nourishment means money.

"The real teacher," says a distinguished school superintendent in one of our large cities, "will always be a student; he will be furnished with an ever-increasing library of his own; he will be a patron of the public library, if one is at hand; he will be a social power in the community where he lives." Art, literature, and music; newspapers, periodicals, and lectures; opportunities to see something of the world; leisure for study and reflection; social position—all these are desirable for every man, but to the progressive teacher they are necessities. With many men they count for almost nothing in their daily work; to the teacher they are a large part of his stock in trade. The standard of living for the high-school teacher ought, therefore, it would appear, to be equal to that maintained by men in other professions and occupations that demand no more in the way of ability, preparation, and expenditure. It should be equal, at least, to the average standard of those who send their children to the public high school.

What, then, is the cost of maintaining such standards? It will vary, evidently, in different communities. Some time ago, a committee appointed to investigate the question of teachers' salaries in New York State sent out to a number of persons, in each of several towns and cities in the State, a request that they should estimate the expense of what they considered a good living for a married man, thirty years old, with a wife and two children. The places to which these requests were sent differed in size from 2,500 up to 3,350,000 inhabitants. The averages, by towns, of the reports submitted by eighty-three persons, representing different localities and occupations, range from $1,367 to $3,816, $2,009 being the general average for the fourteen towns that reported. These estimates make no provision for the future. To each of these averages, therefore, must be added a sum to provide for old age. Seven men in Brooklyn, a coffee broker, a physician, a dentist, a clergyman, a salesman, and two teachers were asked to name a reasonable estimate of such an amount. Both teachers decided that $500 would be a suitable sum to lay aside annually. Their estimate was $200 below the total average. If we add, then,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

$700 to each of the above amounts, we have what, in the opinion of ninety persons, representing different occupations and localities, is an adequate income for a man thirty years old, with a family of three to provide for besides himself.

The figures, as revised, range all the way from $2,069 in small towns, to $4,516 in New York City, with $2,709 as the average for all. In seven of the towns reporting the population is less than 2,500 each, and the cost of living is relatively low. The average of the estimates returned from the seven cities is $3,089. Comparing this amount—which, in the judgment of their own citizens, represents a reasonable standard of living in seven cities in the State of New York—with $1,991, the average of the maximum salaries paid to high-school teachers in thirty of the largest cities of the United States, we find that the standard of a good living is 36 per cent above the maximum salaries received by men teachers in those cities. Comparing it with the average salary paid to the male high-school teacher, we find it soaring above his ability to satisfy his reasonable wants by the discouraging distance of about 54 per cent.

Or, let us take Chicago again as a typical case. It has already been shown that the maximum and minimum salaries that it pays to its high-school teachers are about the same as the averages for thirty of the largest cities of the country. For a number of years it has been the practice of the teacher of economics in one of the high schools of that city to ask his pupils to bring in itemized accounts of their annual expenses, determining such items as food and shelter by dividing the total family expense for those things by the number of persons in the family. The cost per pupil has varied from $150 to $1,500, the average being about $650. Assuming that the expenses of parents, outside of the home, are no greater than those of children of high-school age, this gives us $2,600 as the average annual expenditures of the families represented in this particular high school. The average for this school is probably higher than the general average would be for all the high schools of the city. But the pupils do not to any great extent represent homes of large wealth. They come for the most part from the homes of the moderately well-to-do classes, the homes of men who are earning their living in some profession or in business.

Remembering, too, that little items are likely to be overlooked in making an account of expenditures, and that the demands on the boy and girl of high-school years are apt to be considerably less than those on the parents, aside from the expenses of running the home,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

we may conclude that $2,600 is below, rather than above, the average standard of living of the families represented in the high schools. But this sum makes no provision for the future. Add to it, therefore, $700, and we have $3,300 as the amount necessary to enable the teacher to live on the same scale as the average patron of the high school, and to make suitable provision for old age. But this sum overtops the maximum salary now paid by about 40 per cent, and when compared with the average salary it stands out in an overpowering Alpine grandeur.

Whether we compare the salary of the high-school teacher, then, with the compensation that men of education, ability, and energy are able to command in other professions and occupations, or with the standard of living that the nature of the work demands, it is found to be wanting. It is evident, therefore, that, under present conditions, the number of men of character and ability who are willing to engage in the occupation, expecting to make it a life work, is limited. Outside of the large cities the number of men now teaching in high schools is very small; and of those who are teaching in such cities many, as has been seen, are already engaged in other lines of business, looking forward to the time when they can quit teaching altogether; while others are regretting the fact that it is too late for them to think of making any change.

The question then arises, Is it necessary or desirable to have men in high schools as teachers? Their places could easily be filled by competent women who have no families to support, and especially by young ladies just out of school who are open to engagements of various kinds. They could also be readily filled by youths who can afford to sell their services cheaply for a few years, while they are studying or working up some line of business. Whether it is a work that calls for the services of men who come to stay is not my purpose to answer here. Assuming, however, that it is desirable to have able, experienced men as teachers in our high schools, I have attempted to show that, while the work in its nature is worthy of their highest ambitions and their best efforts, men who possess qualifications that promise success in other professions, or in business, will hardly care to undertake it as a life vocation, since it means a sacrifice of that public esteem that attaches to many callings, a subjection often to harassing and belittling restrictions, and a compensation much less than they would be able to command in other occupations.

EDWARD EMORY HILL.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

U. K., U. S., AND THE SHIP CANAL.

THE Clayton-Bulwer Treaty of 1850 forbade the exclusive control of any future ship canal between the Atlantic and the Pacific by either of the Powers, declared the neutrality of the Canal, and provided that all friendly Foreign States should be asked to enter into similar stipulations. It was a perpetual treaty.

In 1849 American representatives had been negotiating with Central American States for an exclusive right of way, and a treaty signed with Nicaragua that year had provided for the construction of fortifications to defend the interests of the United States. This treaty was repudiated by the Government of the *chargé d'affaires* who had drawn it up; and it was in consequence of this repudiation that the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty had been suggested to us by the Government of the United States.

The Clayton-Bulwer Treaty was followed by other treaties based upon it: one between ourselves and Honduras in 1856, and one between ourselves and Nicaragua in 1860. The main object of all these treaties was stated by us to be "equal treatment" or the "prevention of the imposition of unequal dues." The United States concluded similar treaties with Honduras in 1864 and with Nicaragua in 1867; and France concluded similar arrangements with Nicaragua in 1859 and in 1868.

In 1879–80 the Congressional Committee on Foreign Relations attacked the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty and proposed its abrogation. At that time it was stated that we had violated the treaty in 1852 by an arrangement as to the Bay Islands and the Mosquito Indians. Action taken by Mr. Evarts in 1880 and by Mr. Blaine in 1881, in the direction of the unilateral denunciation of the Treaty, was ultimately dropped in consequence of joint representations by Great Britain and France, in 1883.

With regard to the argument as to our breaking the Treaty, our action on the Mosquito Coast dates from 1630; but the Bay Islands were, in 1859, forever recognized by us as belonging to the Republic of Honduras. The United States Treaties of 1864 and 1867 just

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

named show that our supposed improper action had not changed American policy up to 1867, and it may be hoped that the charge of treaty-breaking in this question may now be regarded as musty, if not irrelevant. I see that it is still made use of by some upon the American side of the Atlantic.

It follows from this little history that the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty does not stand alone, and that its abrogation does not concern only the United Kingdom and the United States. It may, however, be assumed that any well thought-out action in which the two countries mainly interested—the one politically and the other commercially—might concur would be accepted by the other Powers.

It is, of course, possible for the people of the United States to settle the question for themselves. It is improbable that, in the present state of Europe, any Power would interfere by force of arms, however flagrant the breach of treaty. The strength, in the long run, of the United States can hardly be over-rated, and there is no Power and no probable combination of Powers which would willingly accept that country for an enemy. The great majority, however, of United States citizens would desire to seek a solution of the difficulty which should be in accordance with their national honor and with their permanent national interests, in place of one which might be recommended by violent men.

It may be freely admitted that we in Europe are too much inclined to look at the Canal question as one which chiefly interests Powers already possessing a great maritime trade with the Pacific, and insufficiently inclined to consider the politico-commercial importance of the Canal to the United States. The creation of a Canal at the time of the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty was domestically more important to the United States than it is now. It would have meant at that time securing an immediate unity between the Eastern States and the Pacific slope which to many has, at various subsequent times, seemed to be menaced. Since the conclusion of the Civil War and the completion of the Pacific railways the question has diminished in its domestic importance. But it is still important to the United States in an even higher sense than that in which it is important to ourselves as the possessors of the largest carrying trade.

The treaty of this year, known as the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty, set aside the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty in a friendly fashion. But while it is agreed that the United States may make the Canal and manage it, the principle of neutralization is continued and fortification is forbid-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

den, while it is provided that the United States may police the Canal with military and protect it against disorder. The situation established is that which has prevailed in fact with regard to the Suez Canal; for during the time of the Russo-Turkish war, although the Suez Canal was part of the Turkish Empire, Russian men-of-war and Turkish men-of-war refrained from acts of hostility when they met in its water, and the agreement afterward arrived at by a conference in 1888 only indorsed the practice.

The neutrality of the Suez Canal was based on French action. In 1870 the British Government took the view that the neutrality of the Canal was not, in time of war, favorable to British interests. But, although this was the opinion of the Admiralty, and would be again in similar cases, we have always assented to the French opinion, shared by the other Powers, that the world-wide advantages of neutrality in a great commercial highway should make us yield our belligerent rights.

It is provided in the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty, as in the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty, that it shall be brought to the knowledge of the other Powers, and it was no doubt expected that Germany and other maritime Powers would concur.

I am far from attaching weight to many of the laudable attempts which have been made to present this agreement as the only possible agreement, or to exaggerate the difficulties of departing from it. Distinguished Americans who support, in the United States, the Hay-Pauncefote agreement, have gone so far as to suggest that the European Powers would be inclined in time of war to violate the security of the Canal if it were not arranged for by international agreement.

I shall not argue in this fashion, but I do, nevertheless, believe that one suggestion, on the other side, which appears to underlie the denunciations of the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty, and to have suggested the Hepburn Bill, is dangerous. I mean discrimination in tolls for the benefit of American shipping, and power to close the Canal at will against the shipping of some Powers. It is difficult to imagine any course more retrograde and less international; and its theoretical adoption by the United States, though it might not produce immediate hostile action of any kind on the part of any of the European Powers, would undoubtedly give rise to a smouldering uneasiness which might, later on, be fanned into flame. It is not easy to believe that such a policy will prevail in the United States.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

We have not had full reports here of the debates which have taken place at Washington upon the subject. We are told that the Chairman of the Committee of the House has stated his intention to propose discriminating charges directed against foreign shipping; and he and many appear to be directly opposed to the view of Henry Clay that the benefits of an ocean canal ought not to be exclusively appropriated to one nation. This matter is far more important than any theoretical declaration of neutrality.

Supposing it were to be agreed by all the Powers that the United States should not only make and police the Canal, but be allowed to hold it virtually as its own, it would, nevertheless, in my opinion, be in the direct interest of the United States, as well as in the interest of general peace, that the protecting Government should, of its own will, declare the principle of the open-door in the Canal, as regards dues, and the exclusion from it of warlike operations. The mere question of fortification is of little moment. Canals can be stopped without fortifications, and they can be attacked by Powers possessing the command of the sea, and capable of disembarking land forces, in spite of fortifications. The Japanese, for example, predominant at the present moment in the Pacific in a military sense, by reason of the combined strength of their fleet and army and of their power of conducting an expedition across the seas with clock-like precision, would pay little attention to the mere existence of fortifications at any spot where they might desire to make a landing.

I believe the object of Mr. Hepburn is that the United States should have a full share of the commerce of the world, and that, in order to obtain this, he thinks it must place in its hands every power which can be used for promoting its own trade and discouraging that of its rivals. His argument would justify a British prohibition of the use of the Suez Canal by other Powers. His argument assumes that not only Europe, but that great commercial countries like Argentina and Chili would acquiesce in such action on the part of the United States. It is possible that the European Powers at a given moment might appear unwillingly to acquiesce, because they were not strong enough to help themselves, in a closing of the Suez Canal by us; and for the same reasons Europe and South America might acquiesce in discriminating charges in the Atlantic-Pacific Canal; but such a state of things could hardly last, and it is my own opinion that American trade for the more distant markets to which

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the oceanic canals in the greatest degree apply would, in the long run, not be benefited by the transaction.

The sharpness of the curve—to use what is an American phrase—which it is proposed to execute is remarkable. It is the United States which has just succeeded in obtaining from the whole of the European Powers the open-door in China. It is the United States which it is proposed shall build a door open only to herself through Central America. I can understand the unpopularity of my country—Irish feeling, feeling of sympathy for our opponents in the present war, the anxiety of some for an attack on British policy ; I can even understand some of the objections to the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty, and the desire to replace international agreement upon the subject by a purely American system of control ; but the Hepburn policy carried to its logical extreme means militarism for the United States. It means the creation of a fleet powerful enough to face any possible combination of the commercial Powers, apparently wounded in their interests—believing themselves, as they would, to be very gravely wounded—though, for my own part, I do not believe that, supposing peace to be maintained and the policy to be carried out, it would in the long run benefit the trade of the United States.

The United States is beginning to become a great exporting country. Its trade is showing power to conquer new markets even in East Africa, a spot distant indeed from American shores. The commerce of the United States in China is increasing with extraordinary rapidity, though a great deal of it is still done through Hong Kong and other indirect courses, and does not yet appear in the figures of your trade. In the certain future rapid development of the North Pacific, the United States will play a preponderating part ; but its interests will continue to be mixed up with those of other Powers—of Great Britain and her colonies, of Japan, of Russia, and, above all, of Germany. The United States will not be able to treat Eastern Asia as her own. The gigantic trade which she will do there one day will have to be done under international agreement, and upon the principles of international friendship or of "live and let live."

The attempted introduction of the opposite principle into one of the means of communication with the North Pacific would defeat itself. As a military means of access to the Pacific the Canal will be as useless as the Suez Canal is when considered as a military means of access between Europe and the Far East in the event of general war. As a commercial means of access in time of peace it will alone be im-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

portant. But it will not be the sole means of access; and as regards large portions of the West Pacific, and generally speaking the coast of Eastern Asia, it will have to compete with the two long-sea routes. Its competition will not be helped, but will be rather handicapped, by its being made for long years a struggling enterprise, costing money instead of earning it, due to the adoption of a policy of special advantage for one commercial power which, great as it is as a trading power, is not yet a great ship-owning community.

It will be seen by what I have said of fortification that I do not hold the extreme British view. I hope that I understand the extreme American view so far as it is consistent with sanity. I can fully realize the interest taken in the United States in an extension of the Monroe doctrine, such as would, for example, make the neutrality of the future Canal depend upon the action and the guarantee of the various American republics. But to advocate this view, in the belief that it would be sound American policy to apply to the Canal differential treatment in favor of the trade of the United States alone, is, I think, to appeal to the less thoughtful among the American people.

When the ultra-American doctrine was set forward by the President and the Secretary of State (Mr. Evarts) in March, 1880, nothing, I think, was said on the point of differential tariffs on the Canal, and the political and military question was alone in view. The doctrine of Secretary Evarts and Secretary Blaine I can appreciate. It is no doubt idle to suggest that a British fleet could use the non-fortified Canal as a route to the Pacific Coast of the United States in the event of war. No admiral would ever consider such action as, in a naval sense, possible. But that any security should be taken against the possibility even of the existence of such a dream is wise enough, provided that it be made clear to the whole world that it is not intended by reasonable Americans, or likely to be intended by an American majority, to subvert in the Canal the principle of the open-door which the United States demands in China, and by which, throughout the world, in the future, she will have much to gain.

CHARLES W. DILKE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ORGANIZED LABOR IN FRANCE.

In 1884 the workingmen of France obtained for the first time the right to organize. For a century preceding that year, the various governments had treated the question from different points of view, sometimes tolerating, rarely encouraging, and generally suppressing, the spasmodic efforts of the laboring classes to improve their condition. But little by little the conviction grew that suppression, on the one hand, with discontent and even violence, on the other, offered no satisfactory adjustment of the complicated interests of capital and labor. Two facts had been proved by experience: (1) That little was to be gained from the mere good will of employers; and (2) that workingmen unorganized were powerless to improve their lot. But the law of March 21, 1884, offered a solution of the difficulty by authorizing free organization for "the study and defence" of economic and industrial conditions.

Under the sanction of this law the workingmen of France have passed, in sixteen years, from the condition of a mob to that of a disciplined army. Instead of an aimless agitation for something better, there exists a well-defined programme of action leading toward a definite end. Individual effort has been replaced by an organized force, and fitful effervescence by steady endeavor. The results have been commensurate with the change of method. Wages have advanced, the standard of living has risen, the consciousness of power has developed, the desire for education has heightened, and the means of self-help have greatly increased; and, by an alliance with socialism, political influence has been attained, and favorable legislation has been wrested from unwilling parliaments.

France has 38,500,000 inhabitants, of whom about 14,500,000 live by mining, manufactures, transportation, and general commerce. Probably from one-fourth to one-third of this number are actively engaged in the branches named; and, as but a small number are employers or independent, all the rest are workers for wages, presumably at least 3,000,000. What proportion of these are members of unions? According to the latest official figures, those for December

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

31, 1898, only 419,761. Yet the union of this comparatively small number has been the strength of the whole body, and the organization of the few has proved more effective than the aimless agitation of the many.

As to the accuracy of these figures, it is difficult to be certain. On the one hand it is maintained that the unions exaggerate the number of their members, which is very possible ; while, on the other hand, it is said that the unions have become indifferent to the work of the Labor Bureau—which compiles such statistics—and refuse to answer the official questions. At the Congress of Tours (1896), one delegate reported that of 542,500 employees in eleven trades, only 28,582 were members of *syndicats*, and that of these members, but 12,659 regularly paid their dues. Another delegate maintained that the *syndicats* at large embraced more than a million workers. However conflicting these statements may be, it is evident from the constantly recurring strikes that vast numbers of non-members act with the unionists when occasion arises.

According to the official statistics there are in France 2,361 *syndicats*. The term is more definite than our word union. It is employed to designate the legalized union of persons engaged in the same trade, the by-laws of which, together with the names of its officers, must be filed with the executive authorities. Of these *syndicats* 414, with 182,777 members, are in and around Paris. Every branch of trade has its *syndicat*, and the diversity in number of members is as great as in the different trades. Five of them are credited with but three members each, while one has 64,000. Only forty-three of the entire number have 1,000 members or more, and of these twenty-two have their headquarters at Paris. Five of these *syndicats* number between 2,000 and 3,000 members each ; eight have from 3,000 to 4,000 ; one has 8,000 ; and one has as many as 28,000 members.

France is divided into eighty-seven departments, of which only six contain more than 10,000 unionists. These six are naturally those which contain great commercial centres—Paris, Lyons, Marseilles, and Bordeaux—and the coal-mining and iron-manufacturing districts. If we consider the short time which has elapsed since French labor has been free to organize, the growth of unionism and its political progress have been remarkable. In 1884 there were only sixty-eight labor unions in the country, some of which were among those tolerated before the law of March 21 of that year. In fifteen years the number has increased more than thirty-fold, with an increase of power in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

even greater ratio; and the leaders of the French labor movement can look forward with hope to a future of even greater progress.

The by-laws of the *syndicats* generally contain a preamble giving the objects of the organization, among which the increase of wages and the diminution of the hours of labor are prominent. The peaceful adjustment of differences between employer and employed, and the aid of members out of work, sick, or involved in justifiable legal proceedings, are also considered of prime importance. Some *syndicats*, however, have a distinctly religious basis. For example, the Corporation of Lyons Silk Employees declares that the Corporation finds religious and moral principles in its members the most certain guarantee for attaining its proposed object, and therefore makes character an essential condition of admission. It also forbids membership in any secret society. The *Syndicat* of Commerce, of Paris, has declared in print that the object of the *syndicat* is to unite, on industrial and commercial grounds, all young men who are truly Catholic, in order to form by their union a power with which their enemies will be obliged to reckon.

However, by far the larger proportion of labor unions ignore questions of religion, and spend their time and energy in producing profitable work for their members, with education for their successors. The 250 unions of typographers, for example, which contain the best elements of French labor, place among their chief objects the peaceful settlement of all disputes, the possession of a library, the prosperity of printing, and especially the spreading of all knowledge necessary for better typography. In a report of one of the *syndicats* of railway employees much stress is laid on securing improvement in all laws which aim to aid and protect the weak.

The regular dues of the members, in addition to a small initiation fee, are usually fifty centimes or one franc (ten or twenty cents) per month. To this sum many *syndicats* require the addition of a few cents for membership dues of a larger union, either district or national. Then come contributions to congresses, to union festivals, to insurance in the *syndicat* company, etc. Non-payment of dues for three to six months, varying in the different *syndicats*, is sufficient cause for expulsion from membership; but sickness, lack of work, or military service is considered a valid excuse. It is impossible to get exact information as to the sums of money which are annually collected and disbursed by the various labor organizations. Probably fifteen cents a month for each member would be a fair estimate of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

amount contributed for all union purposes; yet that small individual contribution would produce an annual aggregate of $720,000—a sum which, if wisely administered, should accomplish much.

The administrative officers of *syndicats* usually serve without pay; and any member elected to an office is expected to serve. The working head of the *syndicat* is generally the secretary, in whose case an exception is made. This officer is paid at a rate corresponding to the best wages a man of his trade can earn. In answer to a question regarding the character of *syndicat* secretaries in general, the head of the Labor Exchange at Paris assured me that mere agitators were rarely elected to this position by their fellow workingmen. The secretary is in most cases an earnest worker either at his trade or in advancing the interests of his *syndicat*. The loud-mouthed agitator is generally recognized by the workingmen as of less value than the quiet worker.

A *Bourse du Travail*, or Labor Exchange, was opened in Paris, on February 3, 1887; one in Nîmes was inaugurated about the same time; and the number has increased so rapidly that on December 31, 1898, there were fifty-five in existence, including three in Algeria. The constitution of these labor exchanges is in general the same. Each *syndicat* names three delegates to the exchange committee; and from the general body thus formed an executive committee is elected. This committee appoints a secretary, who must devote his entire time to the work of the exchange, receiving therefor a salary commensurate with the earnings of his former employment and the services rendered.

The primary object of the labor exchanges is to have a centre where men of all trades can go when seeking work, and where employers seeking men can find them. The hall or building is usually provided rent free by the municipality, and expenses are covered by a subvention. Sometimes an appropriation is also granted by the Departmental authorities. The amount of these subventions is considerable. The expenses of installation aggregated over 3,000,000 francs; and the subventions for the year 1898 were about 375,000 francs, of which 20,400 francs came from Departments.

Paris is naturally the leader in this movement. Its Municipal Council being largely socialistic, the labor movement receives most generous support; and its Labor Exchange has been the recipient of 2,872,372 francs for first costs, besides a yearly appropriation, which for 1898 was 354,180 francs. The principal building is an immense

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

stone structure near the Place de la République. The manager is M. Dumay, whose career is full of interest. In youth he entered the employment of Creusot, to learn the trade of machinist. His quick intelligence measured the hard lot of the laborer and perceived the means of improving his condition. Then he became an agitator. Such a course brought down on him the wrath of Creusot, and Dumay found himself not only discharged, but followed by persecution wherever he tried to find work in the vicinity. After years of bitter, but fruitful, experience, he entered politics, and was elected a member of the Chamber of Deputies. There, however, he did not find his ideal sphere; and on the reorganization of the Labor Exchange, in 1895, he was named its manager. Here his talents, combined with an intimate acquaintance with workingmen and their needs, find ample and congenial employment.

The census of 1896 in France made an effort to group the inhabitants according to their respective branches of trade. The result, published in 1899, showed that in Paris 648,585 persons were engaged in "industries of transformation." To this total the clothing factories contributed 247,527; the workers in metals and precious stones furnished a contingent of 111,732; while those engaged in masonry and building numbered 62,432; almost the same number were employed in the numerous forms of wood-working; more than 40,000 on food preparations; a like number on furs and leather; and some 31,000 in the various lines connected with the making of books. These figures include not only the capitalists engaged in the said industries, but also many employees not classed among workingmen and not grouped in labor unions. Still, the proportion of workingmen in all the categories will be about the same; and the above statistics give an idea of the relative importance of the trades. Yet, of all the workers in Paris, only 67,462 were attached to the Labor Exchange in December, 1898. All laborers, whether unionists or not, have free entrance to the exchange and the right to seek employment.

The unionists belonging to all the labor exchanges were recently estimated to number 250,000; but the official report of the Labor Bureau reduces the number to 159,284, less than half the whole number of *syndicats* being reported as members of exchanges. Though political agitation is absolutely forbidden to the exchanges, their activity is not by any means limited to getting work for their members. The *syndicats* are doing all in their power to abolish the private employment offices, in order that they may gain the monopoly of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

business. This movement has its enemies as well as its promoters. If successful, it would place an immense power in the hands of the *syndicats*, in the form of a practical monopoly of the labor market. Hence it is opposed not only by employers, but also by advocates of freedom. On their side the *syndicats* decry the corruption and tyranny of the private employment offices, and maintain that only the free placing of labor by the labor organizations can do justice to all concerned.

The secretary of the exchange at Algiers recently tabulated the statistics of his office, showing not only its work in this field, but also what was saved to the toilers. In private employment offices the legal charges are seventy-five centimes for application, five francs for a place found, and fifty centimes for a day's work secured. From the opening of the exchange, May 1, 1892, to December 31, 1899, there were registered 32,493 demands for employment, 13,195 situations secured, 8,805 days' work found, which, at the legal rates given above, would have cost the unfortunate seekers for work a total of 95,649.25 francs, whereas the services of the exchange are gratis. A number of cities have tried to solve the problem by opening free employment offices, and are reported as doing about twice the business of the labor exchanges. The well-known economist Molinari has proposed a plan by which labor exchanges should be operated by wealthy companies, on the same basis as stock, cotton, and oil exchanges. This would reduce labor to the level of a chattel, as he himself admits, and would be but a step above slavery. Ignoring the human element, his scheme leaves no room for family and home life, and certainly will never be accepted by organized labor under the present conditions. Much of the effort of the exchanges is directed to education and mutual assistance, but a great deal more to the propagation of the doctrine that labor should struggle, not only for existence, progress, and elevation, but also for ultimate mastery in human society, and for the enforcement of the dictum that he who will not work shall not eat.

Under the appellation Union or Federation of *syndicats* exist numerous groups, many of national extent, and in the aggregate having a longer list of members than even the exchanges. According to the most recent report there were seventy-six of these unions, made up of 1,132 *syndicats*, with 312,185 members. The most powerful, or at least the best organized, is the French Federation of Book-makers, whose general object is declared to be to maintain prices throughout France, and to render each other moral and financial aid. The union

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

accepts as members all *syndicats* of those engaged in the making and selling of books, and divides them into fifteen categories. While it excludes women from the composing-room, it receives them on an equality when employed in kindred occupations, and advocates the principle of equal pay for equal work.

Another method of restraining competition in the trade is also strongly urged, that of limiting the number of apprentices to one for five journeymen, and requiring an apprenticeship of three years. Recognizing the uselessness of frequent strikes, the by-laws of the federation require that, in case of difference with an employer, no strike shall be declared until the matter has been laid before the committee of the section, by which it will be reported to the committee of the region and the central committee; that no strike shall be declared until all means of reconciliation have been exhausted; but that once declared, the central committee shall send one or more delegates to the scene of action to direct the movement; and that until the difference has been adjusted, each striking member shall receive 3.50 francs per day, Sundays excepted, during a period, if necessary, of thirteen weeks.

The largest *syndicat* is the National Union of Railroad Workers, which is in reality a federation, but which was organized under this title to avoid registering the local officers. It is avowedly a fighting union, formed in 1890 by M. Guérard, who, having been discharged by the company employing him, has since devoted his time and energy to fighting the railway corporations. At one time his *syndicat* was more or less respected, if not feared, by the companies as well as by the government. As early as 1894 it reported over 66,000 members, and later claimed as many as 80,000. But in an evil moment, in 1898, Guérard made the mistake of proclaiming a universal strike—and failed. From its inception this *syndicat* has been a mouth-piece of socialism, and the demands which it has made on the directors of the various railroad corporations would, if conceded, soon have ruined them. One theory especially this *syndicat* has preached both in and out of season, namely, the solidarity of workingmen in all callings; and its annual budget contains provision for lending substantial aid, as well as moral support, to other labor bodies.

In the early days of French labor organization, probably the most powerful *syndicat* was that of the hat-makers, which brought together an immense body of workers, and accumulated some millions

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of francs. But trouble arose, and the government intervened both executively and judicially, so much, indeed, that to-day numbers of socialists will tell you that the corporation was ruined purposely by the government on account of its power and wealth. But the present treasurer attributes the ruin to the lack of corporate union.

The miners of France organized great strikes long before 1884; and under the new law they formed a variety of *syndicats*, some of which attained considerable power in the labor movement and then lost influence. However, others have risen to fill their places; and on December 31, 1898, there existed forty-eight such *syndicats*, one of which (Lens) counted 28,000 members, while the others were comparatively unimportant.

Two factors appear to control the rise and fall of labor unions, and these are seen in full operation among the miners. Under leaders of power and tact thousands of men are led to join the *syndicats*, just as the rolls of church-membership grew under the eloquence of the late Mr. Moody. A successful strike produces a like effect, the power of attraction increasing in proportion to the numbers of the winners. In 1883 a miners' *syndicat* in the Department of the North numbered 7,000 members, and was looked upon as not only prosperous but also influential. On an unhappy day, in 1884, it declared a strike against the Company of Anzin. The number of miners at work fell from 14,035 to 6,135; but the Company held out, the strike ceased, the ring-leaders were discharged forever, and in 1885 the *syndicat* disappeared. In 1898 a new leader appeared on the scene, and in the short space of two months formed a *syndicat* of 5,056 members.

In 1876 there was inaugurated at Paris the first of a long series of labor congresses. The delegates were so earnest in purpose and so moderate in tone that they called forth the praise of those in authority, while the extremists covered them with scorn. A year and a half later the second congress met, this time at Lyons, where bitterness against religious teaching found rude expression. Here socialism was forced into prominence, and political representation of the proletariat appeared upon the programme. Then came the celebrated Congress of Marseilles, which adopted as its official title, Workingmen's Socialist Congress. Over the door of the theatre where the congress sat was this inscription: "Liberty, Equality, Solidarity. No rights without duties, no duties without rights. The land to the peasant, the tools to the laborer, work for all."

Up to this date M. Jules Guesde had limited his socialistic teach-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ings to students ; but he now entered the field of battle. His success was immediate and his victories, for a short period, easy. To many an onlooker the labor movement was now deviating hopelessly from the path of economic development. But there were a few who did not lose sight of the main road, and from time to time they essayed to recall militant labor from its wanderings. The law of 1884 offered to the workingmen of France not only defence against their employers, but also a school of instruction, both as workingmen and as citizens of a republic. Education is necessarily a slow process ; but it seems to furnish the sole means by which men can scale the heights of human possibilities.

The years which followed the Congress of Marseilles were passed in struggles between the various schools of progress and reform. Personal ambition and jealousy entered largely into the contests ; but the diversity of opinion was fundamental. Each group established its organ of promulgation ; it was "the campaign of little papers and big libels" ; and the animosity rose to such a pitch that from mutual recrimination they passed to ostracism and even to blows.

During the period when Boulangism flourished, the workingmen of all shades of opinion thought it best to postpone the settlement of their mutual differences in the presence of the common danger of imperialism. At that time, just as last autumn, they realized that the Republic offered, if not the expression of their ideal, at least the protection of acquired rights and the promise of better times to come. The danger of imperialism having been averted, the same year, 1890, witnessed the definite rupture of the workingmen's organization, not only between the revolutionaries and the coöperatives, the extremists and the moderates in politics, but also between the political place-hunters and the "sleepers," who put their faith in evolution rather than in revolution. At the Congress of Nantes, 1894, the provincial party of politicians was defeated, "amid an infernal uproar," and retired from the scene ; and since that time their official organ and their congresses have both disappeared.

The principal element of discord having been thus separated from the great body of organized labor, it was finally possible to unite the economic elements on a common ground. This was accomplished by the National Corporate Congress, held at Toulouse, in 1897. Under three categories of membership the vast majority of the labor unions of the country took part in this congress : (1) The labor exchanges ; (2) the national federations and the *syndicats*, whether manufactur-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing or commercial ; and (3), local trade federations, and such isolated *syndicats* as did not form federations or whose federations refused to join the confederation. But it was especially provided that no two organizations of the same trade could be admitted separately, nor two local federations of the same place. By this congress it was felt that a new start had been made toward the union and consequent emancipation of labor. The watchword was, "The Universal Strike" ; or, in other words, revolution with folded arms.

In the early days of last December a Socialist Congress assembled at Paris. It was greeted with mockery by a certain element of the public, and with incredulity or doubt by others ; but in it the working, thoughtful socialists had placed their hopes. Delegates of the proletarian organizations had been summoned together, whatever their shades of opinion, provided they accepted the minimum socialistic programme. Besides the five principal divisions of socialists there were represented numerous minor political groups, and, as a new departure, the labor unions and the coöperative societies. From the diverse elements here meeting a supreme effort was to be made for the unification of a Socialist Party. Here men who had separated in anger years before, and had since lived in estrangement, came together with a common purpose. Speech was free, and the language was not always polite. Fists were raised, and cries of rage and defiance were exchanged.

But reason gained the day. Division had hitherto brought weakness ; strength must now come from union. As one organization after another announced its unanimous adhesion to the new programme, as one leader followed another on the stand, with enthusiastic assurances of his personal devotion, the vast crowd became more and more excited. Before long they were all afoot, hats tossed in air, hands waving wildly, shouts of approval shaking the rafters. The red flags of socialism were jerked from their places, carried to the platform, and waved in exultation over the few surviving communists of 1871 ; while the hitherto opposing leaders, Guesde, Vaillant, and Jaurès, came to the front, grasped hands, like Tell and his friends of old, and vowed devotion to the formation of a new and juster government than the world had yet produced. A singer advanced and intoned some stirring couplets, and thousands of voices rang back the refrain. It was a feast of peace and reconciliation. The unification of French labor had been accomplished. WALTER B. SCAIFE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE PREËMINENT PROFESSION: A REJOINDER.

Of all occupations, the ministry is said to be the most underpaid and, at the same time, the most overworked. This is claimed to be due to an overcrowding of the profession, a circumstance which, it is thought, causes the ministers to be afraid to preach what they believe; thus exposing them to a temptation which is destructive. If the community is not quite ready to shoot the old ministers, and those who are already in the ranks have not the courage to commit hari-kari, young men are urged to refrain from entering the profession until the proper equilibrium has been restored.

All this is said [1] with a friendliness and a brightness of mood which recall the much-glorified "sweetness and light" of Matthew Arnold—gifts that have been envied, because they enabled him to say such nasty things of those he did not like. Ministers are not exactly put upon the defensive; for Mr. Barrymore writes ostensibly in their behalf, endeavoring to point out the difficulties under which they labor, and to awaken sympathy if not to secure for them better conditions. As the ministry was certainly, at one time, the most honored of the professions, and to-day has functions which stand in vital relation to the welfare of all, it may be worth while to take up some of the charges that are so lightly made, and inquire into the facts.

It is assumed that the ministry is greatly overcrowded, and that this overcrowding is the source of the evils from which it is suffering. Is this true? For the purpose of inquiry let us take the Congregationalists, a denomination which may be fairly regarded as representing the average condition. In point of numbers, this denomination has long stood sixth or seventh. It is widely spread over the country, and, for one reason or another, its ministry has been looked upon as presenting rather more than the average attraction. It may, therefore, be taken as constituting a fair exhibit of the whole. It has 628,000 members, is vigorous and steadily growing, and presents conditions which may be regarded as normal. Fortunately its de-

[1] See the article on "The Paradoxical Profession," by Mr. Henry J. Barrymore, in The Forum for April, 1900.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nominational statistics are unusually full and exact. In 1858 it had 2,409 ministers and 2,369 churches, and in 1898 it had 5,639 ministers and 5,620 churches—an almost identical ratio. That this ratio has been generally maintained appears from the fact that for the period from 1858 to 1898 inclusive, taken by decades, the number of ministers has been 2,409, 2,969, 3,496, 4,408, 5,639, while at the same dates the number of churches has been 2,369, 2,951, 3,620, 4,569, 5,620. By this it will be seen that for forty years at least the number of ministers has not varied materially from the number of churches.

In the year 1858, however, of 2,409 ministers 663 were reported as not engaged in pastoral work, while in 1898, of 5,639 ministers 1,955 were not in charge of churches—27½ per cent in the first instance against 34½ per cent in the second. This increase of 7 per cent in the number of those not in the active pastorate may give some show of justice to the accusation that there are too many ministers. But before the charge is accepted we must note that the number of churches unsupplied with pastors rose in the same period from 472 to 1,378. This indicates that in 1898 a far larger number of churches were making a change, with a corresponding number of ministers in transition.

This in itself may be a serious state of affairs, worthy of the attention of the Christian community; since it gives rise to questions as to the stability of the pastorate, and the causes of restlessness in the churches. It does not, however, indicate a surplus of ministerial supply. When, furthermore, it is considered that in the list of ministers not engaged in pastoral work are included the aged, the infirm, all serving as foreign missionaries, those engaged in literary and charitable work, and those who are in transition from one church to another, the apparent surplus will be greatly reduced. Last year ninety-five names were removed from the list by death, which is about the annual average; while, for ten years, the yearly accession to the ranks from the senior classes of the seminaries has been 117, with perhaps an addition of thirty entering the ministry after special courses. This is hardly more than enough to make up for the loss by death, with an allowance for the continuous growth in the number of churches. That there is an inflow of ministers from other denominations cannot be denied; but as the same thing occurs in all bodies of Christians it may be regarded as not affecting the general proportion.

That many ministers are seeking pastorates is unquestionable;

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

but there are many physicians and lawyers who cannot earn a livelihood by their professions. There are graduate doctors in medicine in New York who are working as conductors on the street cars, just as there are ministers who are peddling books, and others who are eager to accept any work by which they can earn bread for their families. But does this prove that there is no call for men in any of these professions? Look at the difficulty of getting a successor when a vacancy occurs in the pastorate of any important church. The crowd of applicants proves nothing, for in every rank of life men are always ready to move up higher. It was never more difficult to find a competent man for an important pastorate than it is to-day; and when he is found and called, almost invariably another vacancy is created which is nearly or quite as difficult to fill. It is easy to say the churches are captious; but the fact is, that men of the kind needed were never scarcer, or more highly prized, than they are now. Never have the churches more clearly and emphatically demanded clean, straight, earnest, competent men, who have a message, and know how to deliver it. No young man need for a moment be deterred from entering the ministry for fear of not finding an opportunity for service, if he feels in his heart the divine call.

The number of deaths among Congregational ministers between 1875 and 1898 was 2,041. The average age of these men was sixty-eight years, and the average length of service, thirty-six and three-quarter years. Of these, 421 were over eighty-one years of age, and 1,453 were over sixty. It is doubtful whether such a degree of longevity can be found in any other occupation. It would seem to indicate that, whatever may be the strain under which he is obliged to labor, the minister lives under conditions which make it possible for him to bear that strain; so that he has no reason either to ask the sympathy of the public or to commiserate himself.

Although for the first year or two the minister's compensation may be better than that obtained by young men entering other professions, it advances at a far slower rate, and the maximum is none too high—and this must be considered side by side with the fact that he is required to spend many years in obtaining a costly education, that he has no opportunity of making money outside of his profession, and that his expenses are steadily on the increase. Nevertheless, the homes of the ministry throughout the country are quite above the average of those of the members of their congregations. In the newer communities, indeed, the minister's home is

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

almost invariably one of the most comfortable in the town. The visitor will find there cleanliness, refinement, a hospitable welcome, and well-prepared food, and may cast himself upon its hospitality with a greater assurance of welcome than anywhere else in the village.

For more than 200 years the most successful scholars in our higher institutions of learning have come from these ministerial homes; and they have supplied a far larger number of accomplished men and women in all ranks of life than have the homes of any other class. The Congregational parsonages have been not only the abode of refinement, culture, and comfort, but they have represented a thrift which has rarely permitted their children to go out into the world unprovided for, or the occupants themselves to suffer want in old age. The increase in the cost of living bears heavily upon all who draw fixed salaries, and particularly upon those who are expected to advance with the times. Even the city ministers of to-day, excepting a few whose salaries are no measure of those of their brethren, find themselves compelled to live under conditions in which it is difficult to make ends meet—more so, indeed, than the members of their congregations realize. The latter, in most instances, whether living on salaries or engaged in business, experience increases of income which justify increase in luxuries. From this standpoint the minister is not so well circumstanced as are his neighbors. But when we consider that he has deliberately turned away from other occupations which have money as their reward, to engage in a career affording opportunities for rare privileges and delights, he cannot complain if he finds himself in a condition which denies him much that his neighbors enjoy.

The charge that the minister is afraid to preach what he believes is an old one, and to-day has in it probably no more of truth than it has of novelty. In the seventeenth century an old apologist indignantly repudiated it. "*Quaenam religio illa est quae hoc dicere prohibeat quod verum est?*" Human nature being the same, there is doubtless the same temptation as of old for a man who thinks he has found a new idea to give himself the luxury of exploiting it. Indeed, the danger which is to-day emphasized, and deprecated by thoughtful persons generally, is the prevailing habit of rushing into the pulpit and into print with every new theory, before it has had time to be duly considered; and this applies to economics, civics, and politics, as well as to religion and morals.

Over against the fear the preacher may feel of uttering truth that will not be agreeable to his rich parishioners may be set the tempta-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion for him to say the things which will catch the public ear and win for him a reputation for independence and courage. Lyman Beecher was no coward, but long ago he felt called upon to write this: "If I find myself going off the track of the general philosophizings and Biblical expositions of the generations of the great and learned and good who have gone before me, I assume that there is such presumptive evidence that I may be wrong as to demand great circumspection in coming to an opposite conclusion." This is a wiser method than exploiting every new view the moment a man catches sight of it.

As to the peculiar temptations to which the minister is exposed there is doubtless much that may be said. But so there is as to the temptations that lie close to the life of every man in the community. There is the temptation of worldliness; but who escapes it? The community is in great peril from its rich men. Unquestionably the doctor cultivates his rich patients; the lawyer becomes the servant of the great corporations; the shop-keeper is obsequious to his rich customer; the rich man bows before the richer one; and the whole community is thoroughly conscious of the value of money. But it would be easy to show that the minister is far freer from this influence, and less given to yielding to it, than any other man in the community. It may be little to his credit, but it is incident to his position, and it is expected of him. He would be degraded in the eyes of the community and in his own, if he were recognized as yielding to it.

The great danger of wealth is to the possessor of it, and from that the minister is happily delivered. The millionaire is the man whose heart is likely to be corroded. In general he is compelled to live in a world of his own, where standards are artificial, ideals are low, restraints are few and feeble, and truth rarely is spoken to his ears. Of all men in the community the minister is the one to whom he can turn for the help he needs in the battle of life. While, therefore, here and there a rich man may be suspected of laying snares for his pastor's feet, or putting temptation in his way, it is also true that he may be counted upon to estimate the value his pastor has for him in proportion to his manliness, his frankness, and his truth.

There is much nonsense talked about the impossibility of any man being able properly to perform the amount of intellectual labor which is required of an ordinary pastor. Of course, any congregation would have a right to be proud if it had a pastor famed throughout the land for his ability to produce highly finished works of art for their weekly delectation. But this is not the function of the pulpit; and,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

without fear of serious contradiction, it may be said that it is not the demand of the pew. The minister enters his pulpit for another purpose. He is an ambassador charged with a message. And while it is his duty to deliver that message in such a form as to be listened to and understood and remembered, it is not a part of his duty so to deliver it that it will be looked upon principally as a finished literary production. There doubtless are ministers who have this ambition, as there doubtless are churches which seek this distinction; but most ministers carry in their hearts the thought, if not the words, of the old Stoic addressing the preachers of his day: "What! try to be admired, when sick people are to be cured? Offer words to people who want help? Give us light; advise us how to face life. Speak to me of piety and justice and temperance; give me none of your rhetorical tricks; help me to some pure resolution; teach me some lesson; reform me, or, at any rate, make reform possible." "*Aut sanior domum redeam aut sanabilior.*"

This is the minister's business. With this burden on his heart it is not true that he is at his wit's end to find the message which he shall bring to the people Sabbath by Sabbath. Nor is it true that his labors among them as a pastor—going in and out of their homes, entering their lives, taking upon his heart their burdens—unfit him for the work of the pulpit. On the contrary, the testimony of the most successful churches will show that those ministers who live nearest to the hearts of their people are the ones whom their people most willingly hear on Sunday. The floating crowd may be won by the orator or the mountebank; but it is not in this way that churches are built up, or that the position of the minister in the community is secured. It is doubtless true that there are times when the minister speaks because he is expected to speak rather than because there is that within him which must find utterance; but this is no more than saying that no man is always at his best. The sufficient answer to the accusation is in the career of not a few of the more honored and beloved ministers that New York has known. The names of Storrs and Cuyler, Hall and Taylor, Adams and Vail, not to go back further and say Washburn and Tyng, Deems and Crosby, Bethune and Cox, are a sufficient answer to the charge that the pastor cannot preach as he should, and at the same time be a true pastor to his church and to the community. There is no just reason to believe that the race has run out, or that the minister's ideals have changed.

H. A. Stimson.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

AMERICAN AND CANADIAN TRADE RELATIONS.

THE relative geographical positions of the United States and Canada, with their conterminous boundary line extending from the Atlantic to the Pacific, with similarity of ethnological conditions, of laws, and of political institutions, should naturally lead to intimate commercial and social relations. Affinities so pronounced as those existing between these two sections of the North American continent can only fail to produce such results through the interposing of policies calculated to impair the influence of natural conditions. The two countries, while geographically a unit, are possessed of dissimilarity of climate and diversity of production to a degree so marked as to be calculated to stimulate intercommunication and commerce. Canada requires the raw cotton, the tobacco leaf, the iron, steel, and coal of the United States for her manufacturing operations; she requires also the tropical fruits of the South and a great variety of American manufactures; and in exchange it is natural that she should send to the United States her forest, farm, and mine products.

The natural barriers which separate portions of the two countries —the great inland seas, and the mighty river which is their outlet— are of a character to invite and facilitate intercommunication rather than to offer obstacles to its fullest development. The geographical position of the eastern portion of the United States is such as to afford to the province of Ontario, to a portion of the province of Quebec, and to the vast Canadian Northwest, with its enormous future possibilities, the shortest and most feasible routes to the sea. Portland, Boston, New York, Philadelphia, and Baltimore are the natural winter ports of extensive sections of the Canadian territory; and the Erie Canal and the railway routes from Buffalo to the sea-board have afforded hitherto the nearest and most inviting outlets to tide-water for a considerable portion of the exportable products of the sections of Ontario bordering upon Lakes Erie, Huron, and Superior, and for the grain of Manitoba and the Canadian Northwest which finds its outlet by lake shipment from Fort William.

Movements have already been made for the establishment of car-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ferry services across Lake Erie from the coal-mines and iron-works of Pennsylvania and Ohio to the rich district of Western Ontario. A harbor is approaching completion at Port Burwell, on the north shore of Lake Erie, which will afford deep water as well as excellent facilities for winter entrance at a point which geographically is most advantageous. A short line from this port connects with all the trunk lines of Ontario, and will not only furnish inward business, but will afford an outlet, summer and winter, by car ferriage, for the various Canadian products seeking exportation. In winter, these can be sent much more cheaply and expeditiously to Baltimore and Philadelphia than to Canadian points. This is one of many schemes for increased facilities of transportation, and is mentioned to illustrate the fact that the possibilities for development of intercommunication and for increase of business between the two countries are indefinite and well-nigh unlimited.

Intimate knowledge of the extent and resources of Canada is not as a rule possessed by the American people. Little is known of the country, of its future possibilities, of its area, and of its value as a customer at the very door of the United States. Even under the conditions that at the present moment govern trade, conditions which, as far as the fiscal policy of the United States is concerned, are repressive, Canada, with its 5,500,000 inhabitants, is a better customer to the United States than all of Spanish America, with a population of 55,000,000 and comprising Mexico, the Central American States, all of South America, and all of the West Indies, including Cuba and Porto Rico. For the year 1898, the total exports of the United States to this enormous region reached the sum of $86,786,000, while the total exports of the United States to Canada for the same year were $86,537,000. For the year 1899, the exports to Canada from the United States have largely increased, exceeding in amount the exports to Spanish America and the West Indies. This fact is indicative of the possibilities of trade between the United States and the northern half of the North American continent.

The total trade of Canada last year, exports and imports, was $312,948,000, divided as follows:

Total trade with Great Britain	$136,151,000
Total trade with the United States	138,140,000
Total trade with all other countries	38,657,000

Of this total trade the amount with Great Britain consisted chiefly

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of exports, while the amount with the United States consisted chiefly of imports.

The total exports to Great Britain were	$99,860,000
The total imports from Great Britain were	37,600,000
The total exports to the United States, ex coin, bullion, and estimated short returns, which latter were more than counterbalanced by smuggling into Canada, were	36,562,000

Of this amount the exports to the United States, the produce of Canada, ex coin, bullion, and estimated short returns, were $34,766,000.

The total imports from the United States were	$101,642,000
The total exports of Canada to all foreign countries except the United States and Great Britain were	14,677,000
The total imports from all other countries were	24,175,000

BALANCES OF TRADE.

The balance of trade against Canada on total exports and imports was	$3,868,000
The balance of trade in favor of the United States on total exports and imports was	56,509,000
The balance of trade against Canada on total exports and imports with all foreign countries except the United States and Great Britain was	9,499,000
The balance of trade against Great Britain upon total exports and imports was	62,141,000

In other words, Canada sold to Great Britain more than she purchased from that country, and used the chief part of this balance in her favor to pay for her importations from the United States.

The superior liberality of the Canadian trade policy as compared with that of the United States is clearly demonstrated by a statement of the relative rates of duties levied by the two countries. For the year 1899 the Canadian rates of duties were as follows:

Rate of duty upon total imports	15.81
Rate of duty upon imports for consumption	16.07
Rate of duty upon dutiable imports	26.16
Rate of duty upon dutiable imports for consumption	28.77

In the United States the rates of duty for the previous year were:

On total imports	24.78
On dutiable imports	49.20

The exact rate for 1899 is not at hand, but it could have varied only slightly from that of 1898.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Notwithstanding the preferential rate of 25 per cent in favor of Great Britain—which has been increased during the present session of Parliament to 33⅓ per cent, and which it is probable, in the estimation of the Canadian Government, has been called for by the superior liberality of Great Britain toward Canada in trade matters as compared with the United States—and notwithstanding the fact that England furnishes a market for Canadian products greatly in excess of that furnished by the United States, the volume of imports from each country still leaves a decided advantage in favor of the United States. From the latter country we purchase a class of manufactures quite distinct in the main from the kinds purchased of Great Britain; and the differential duties do not seem to have had the practical influence upon the relative volumes of trade of the two countries that might have been anticipated. The rates of duty from Great Britain, from the United States, and from the rest of the world, including the British possessions, for the year 1899, were as follows:

FROM GREAT BRITAIN.

Rate of duty upon total imports	19.80
Rate of duty upon imports for consumption	19.83
Rate of duty upon dutiable imports	26.69
Rate of duty upon dutiable imports for consumption	26.27

FROM THE UNITED STATES.

Rate of duty upon total imports	11.52
Rate of duty upon imports for consumption	12.59
Rate of duty upon total dutiable imports	24.22
Rate of duty upon dutiable imports for consumption	24.13

FROM ALL OTHER COUNTRIES, INCLUDING THE BRITISH POSSESSIONS.

Rate of duty upon total imports	27.68
Rate of duty upon imports for consumption	27.94
Rate of duty upon dutiable imports	37.98
Rate of duty upon dutiable imports for consumption	38.37

The imports of Canada per capita for 1899 were as follows:

Total imports, per capita	$29.59
Imports from Great Britain, per capita	6.71
Imports from the United States, per capita	18.48
Imports from the rest of the world, per capita	4.40

Contrasted with this is the fact that the total imports per capita of the United States from Canada were $0.60. Words cannot strengthen the presentation of the case made by the cold figures.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The liberality of the Canadian trade policy toward the United States as contrasted with the repressive trade policy of the latter country toward Canada is further illustrated by the statement that the total importation of free goods for consumption into Canada for the year 1899 amounted to $64,618,000, of which amount different countries furnished as follows:

United States	$48,535,000
Great Britain	9,538,000
All other countries	6,544,000

The advantage enjoyed by the United States in the matter of free entry for goods into Canada, as compared with other countries, will be shown by a statement of the amounts, based on percentages. Upon this basis the result is as follows:

Percentage of free goods from the United States	75.11
Percentage of free goods from Great Britain	14.91
Percentage of free goods from all other countries	9.98

To offset this enormous free list in favor of the United States it is doubtful whether $5,000,000 worth of Canadian products are given free admission into the American market. The percentages of imports into, and exports from, Canada are as follows:

IMPORTS.

Total imports	$162,764,000
Total imports from Great Britain	$36,945,000
Percentage of total imports	22.69
Total imports from the United States	$101,642,000
Percentage of the total imports	62.44
Total imports from all other countries	$24,175,000
Percentage of total imports	14.87

EXPORTS.

Total exports of Canada	$158,896,000
Total exports of Canada to Great Britain	$99,086,000
Percentage of the total amount	62.35
Total exports to the United States, including coin and bullion $4,011,151, and estimated short returns $4,559,530	$45,133,000
Percentage of the total amount	28.40
Total exports to all other countries	$14,677,000
Percentage of the total amount	9.25

A striking illustration of the unsatisfactory condition of trade relations between the two countries, viewed from a Canadian stand-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

point, is furnished by the statistics of 1899 relating to the export and import trade in farm products. As is seen by the above statements, Canada is a large importer of American products, and this is especially the case in regard to American manufactures. The general impression is that Canada's exports of farm products to the United States are greatly in excess of the amount of her imports in the same line from that country. Being a purchaser to an enormous extent of the products of American skilled labor, it is but natural to suppose that Canada should find a market in the United States to an equal, or a nearly equal, extent for her raw material, in exchange for such finished commodities as she purchases. On a fair basis of trade arrangement this ought to be the case. As facts actually exist, however, the market in the United States for Canadian farm products is of comparatively small moment; Canadian sales to the United States of farm products being very much less than Canadian purchases of farm products from that country.

The export of farm products, the produce of Canada, to the United States, for 1899, was as follows:

Export of agricultural products	$1,149,686
Export of animals and their products	4,628,533
Total	$5,778,219

Imports of farm products for consumption by Canada from the United States, for 1899, were as follows:

Imports of agricultural products from the United States for consumption, dutiable and free, for 1899	$18,686,000
Imports of animals and their products from the United States for consumption, dutiable and free, for 1899	5,762,000
Total	$24,448,000

Of these amounts, $16,202,612 of agricultural products and $3,514,938 of animals and their products were free.

The surprising result, therefore, is, that in 1899 Canada bought farm products from the United States for consumption to the extent of more than four times the value of the farm products she sold to that country. If from the list of her purchases of farm products from the United States we should eliminate raw cotton and tobacco leaf, amounting to $4,989,000, the account would stand: Purchases, $19,459,000; sales, $5,778,000—purchases over three and one-third times as great as the sales.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The same year the sales of Canada to Great Britain, of agricultural products, the produce of Canada, were $18,447,000, and of animals and their products, the produce of Canada, $41,604,000, total $60,051,000; making the exports of farm products, the produce of Canada, to Great Britain more than ten times as great as her exports of the same products to the United States. This, and the fact that the total imports of Canada from the United States were nearly three times greater than her total imports from Great Britain, will serve to illustrate why her Government has seen fit to give Great Britain preferential treatment.

It may seem surprising that so great a disparity should exist between the imports of farm products from the United States into Canada and the exports in the same line from Canada to the United States. The reason is twofold: (1) The American duties on the agricultural schedule are evidently designed to be as nearly as possible prohibitive; and (2) Canada has a vast and ever-increasing market for food products in her new mining regions and in other sections of the Dominion, and has a large population of food consumers not engaged in the production of food. This population is chiefly engaged in lumbering, mining, and the fisheries.

As another illustration of the greater liberality of Canadian fiscal regulations as compared with those of the United States, the permission to import corn from the United States free of duty may be mentioned. Corn was placed upon the free list in 1897. The importation of that grain last year from the United States amounted to 23,342,000 bushels, valued at $8,966,000. For this concession no corresponding concession, either in reduction of duty or in placing any kind of grain upon the free list, has been made by the United States.

The importation of manufactures from the United States into Canada in 1898 amounted to $40,662,000, and in 1899 to $48,645,000. This amount exceeded the importation of manufactures from Great Britain for that year by the sum of $11,500,000. Of this importation, $13,292,000 was on the free list. The farmers of Canada probably took not less than $25,000,000 of the entire amount, and, in return, they were permitted to sell to the United States the comparatively insignificant amount of $5,778,219 of farm products, while they saw the farmers of the United States taking possession of their own markets in the same line to the extent of three and a third times that amount.

The above statistics will make clear the fact that the American

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

market is practically sealed to Canada for the products of the farm. Naturally, therefore, Canada has turned her attention to seeking new outlets; and having done so with great success, the importance of the American market to her is becoming of smaller moment year by year. A feeling is also gradually taking hold of the public mind, which, if not one of hostility, is one of intense dissatisfaction with the commercial policy of the United States toward Canada; and the day is probably not distant when practical action will be demanded, either in the shape of securing increased exports to the United States or of adopting a policy which will very sharply curtail importation from that country.

The lumber trade of Canada with the United States has of late been one of diminishing quantity; and the American policy of imposing heavy duties upon forest products amounts, in effect, to a liberal premium on forest destruction in the United States. The rapidly diminishing supply of white pine, it appears from the best authorities, will be practically exhausted in five years more, and the American duty of $2 per thousand is hastening the day when the last pine-tree will be cut. The duty upon Canadian lumber is rapidly changing the course of Canadian trade in that article. Until within the last three years the exports of forest productions to the United States exceeded the exports in the same line to Great Britain. Last year, however, the exports to the British possessions amounted to $16,361,000, while the quantity exported to the United States had shrunk to $9,921,000, a considerable portion of which passed through the United States in bond for export. While this trade is burdened with the duty of $2 per thousand, Canada imported from the United States last year forest products free of duty to the amount of $2,996,000. The Government has refused the demand of Canadian lumbermen to impose duties upon this importation corresponding to the American duties upon importations of the same class into that country; wisely deeming it improper to burden new settlers in the Northwest by duties upon lumber which in many sections can be obtained more cheaply from Minnesota than from Canadian sources.

The feeling of resentment caused by the meagre character of the American free list as compared with that of Canada, and the striking of lumber from the free list when the Wilson Bill was superseded by the Dingley Bill, finds expression in the province of Ontario in the prohibition of the export of saw-logs and pulp-wood, and in the province of Quebec in a differential Crown due on the export of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pulp-wood of $1.50 per cord, the Crown due for local consumption being forty cents per cord, and for export $1.90. Upon the broad ground of political economy this system unquestionably is bad policy, and it is highly unfavorable to the interests of those holding timber; but it is almost universally popular, because it is felt that it affords a method of striking back and giving a *quid pro quo* for an ungenerous policy toward us. Its chief weakness lies in the fact that its application to old sales of timber berths and to licenses issued before the passage of the law is denounced by the sufferers as a breach of faith. No one, perhaps, would feel disposed to cavil at its application in all cases when it has been, or can be made, a condition of sale; but the *ex-post-facto* feature of the legislation is no doubt of very questionable character.

The statements of trade relations between America and Canada contained in this article make it evident that the American fiscal policy toward Canada is illiberal as compared with the Canadian fiscal policy toward the United States. That it is in the interest of the United States it is hardly possible to believe. The export trade between Canada and the United States in articles the produce of Canada has practically stood still since the abrogation of the Reciprocity Treaty in 1866, and in 1899 was actually a fraction less than in the former year. The admission to the American market of Canadian farm products would have little, if any, influence upon prices received by American agriculturists, as Canadian importations would be so small, compared with the great volume of American production, as to produce little influence upon market prices. The fear of Canadian competition, on the part of the American farmer, is ill-founded; for both meet in the common market of England for the sale of farm products, and the interchange of such products between the two countries would not produce the slightest effect.

Had free trade in natural products been permitted since 1866, or even for a period of ten or fifteen years past, the volume of trade between the two countries would have been beyond all reasonable doubt two or three times greater than it is at present. The two peoples would have been brought into more intimate relations, both socially and commercially; the tone of public sentiment in the two countries would have been more healthy; and each country would have known more about the other, which is all that is necessary to assure mutual respect. Unquestionably, by fostering such intimate trade relations, the interests of each country, and of the entire

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

English-speaking race, would have been promoted, with the natural concomitant of more friendly feeling.

The present condition of affairs, if permitted to continue, will develop into more serious estrangement, and will probably lead in due time to imitation, by the Government of Canada, of the fiscal policy of the United States, as concerns the relations between these two countries. It might perhaps be worth the while of American economists to consider the probable effect of raising the Canadian standard of 26 per cent on dutiable imports to the American standard of 49 per cent, with perhaps an increase of the differential in favor of Great Britain. This course would greatly stimulate the development of our manufacturing system; and it would also enable our farmers to furnish food for the operatives whose products they consume, a privilege now almost absolutely denied to them in the case of the American operatives, whose productions were taken last year by Canadian consumers to the extent of more than eight times the value of Canadian farm products permitted entrance into the markets of the United States.

JOHN CHARLTON.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A CONTRIBUTION TO THE ARMENIAN QUESTION.

To compute the number of Armenians at present existing is one of the most difficult problems conceivable. The number in Russia has been established with tolerable accuracy, and that dispersed throughout Austro-Hungary, Egypt, India, and other distant lands, is also approximately known ; but in regard to Turkey, where most of the Armenian people still reside, our information is practically *nil.*

To-day Russia contains about 1,000,000 Armenians, and Persia some 50,000. The Turkish Government, interested in reducing the figure to a minimum, states the number of Armenians living under the sceptre of the Sultan at 1,000,000. The indications are, however, that 1,500,000 is a far safer estimate.

The boundaries of the territory designated as Armenia are difficult to define. In a general way, however, it may be asserted that the area comprehends the two sources of the Euphrates, the Sea of Wan, Mount Ararat, and in great part the course of the river Araxes —without, however, bordering at any point upon the Black Sea or upon the Mediterranean. Within these limits we have a total area about the size of South Germany or of the State of Pennsylvania. The country is bounded on the south by Kurdistan, on the west by Asia Minor, on the north by the Russian Caucasus, Georgia, and on the east by the Persian province of Aderbaijan.

It would be erroneous to assume that a line completely surrounding the above-mentioned region would also embrace the entire Armenian community, or that the Armenians dwelling there outnumber all other resident nationalities. Armenians have long migrated in all directions far beyond the boundaries of their native land ; while Mohammedan intruders—principally Kurds, but also Turks in considerable numbers—have established settlements in the province. Indeed, there are few districts of any considerable extent where the Armenian element may be found compactly massed. A continuous emigration of centuries has gradually spread the Armenian element over a territory fully four times as large as the original province; and within this wider area the Armenians form a fluctuating minority of but 5

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to 10 per cent of the entire population; the greatest density probably existing in Eastern Cilicia and in the adjacent southern spurs of the Taurus, around Adana, Aintab, and Urfa. Armenians are also well represented in the great seaports and commercial centres of Caucasia and the Levant—in Tiflis, Baku, Batum, Constantinople, Smyrna, and Odessa. Scattered colonies, ranging from two or three hundred to several thousand souls, may be found in the interior of Russia, as well as in Austro-Hungary, Poland, Bulgaria, Egypt, Palestine, and East India; while, during the last few decades, a great many have also emigrated to America.

To form a clear conception of the so-called "Armenian Question," a knowledge of the general features of Armenian history is necessary. The first reference to Armenians is found in the inscriptions of the Persian kings of the Achæmenidian dynasty, and here they are already designated by their present title "Arminu." This title, however, is not employed by the natives, who from time immemorial have styled themselves "Haik" (plural of Haj), and their country, Hajastan. They trace their establishment to the earliest ages, and claim direct descent from Noah. This theory, however, is now no longer tenable; for modern scientific research has successfully demonstrated that the Armenians did not occupy their present domain until the sixth century B.C. Further, it has been shown that they came as conquerors from unknown parts (possibly from Northern Syria and Eastern Cilicia) and settled near the Wan Sea, where they subjugated a people calling itself "Chalder," presumably "Chaldeans" or "Chaldees," but designated by the Assyrians "Urartu"; and it is to this land of the Urartu that the Bible refers when it says the ark of Noah rested upon the mountains of Ararat. Not until the Christian era did the idea arise that this mount was synonymous with Massis, the highest peak of hither Asia, situated in the district of "Ayrarat" about midway in the course of the Araxes. It is significant that even at the present day, and within the country itself, this Mount Massis is known as Ararat only to scholars.

In all probability the Armenians long constituted a warrior caste among the subjugated Urartu, until, in the course of centuries, victor and vanquished finally became amalgamated. The former belonged to the Aryan or Indo-European stock, while the latter were probably identified with that earlier race, which, although it is the ancestral stock of several Caucasian peoples, is still enveloped in mystery. At all events, the language of the conqueror, which is re-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lated to the ancient Persian, became the dominant one, and has so remained to the present day.

Soon after this amalgamation of races was effected, Armenia became a province of the Persian Empire under Cyrus and his successors; and it was during this period, when the country was governed by a royal satrap, that Xerxes and his 10,000 made their famous march through it from Babylon to the Black Sea, after the battle of Cunaxa (winter of 401–400 B.C.). After the death of Alexander the Great, Armenia was incorporated into the empire of the Seleucidæ; and after the defeat of King Antiochus III by the Romans (190 B.C.), it revolted against the Roman authority and set up the first native king of Armenia to whom history bears witness—Artaxias. It was for this monarch that Hannibal, flying from the Romans and seeking shelter at the courts of Asia Minor, built the capital Artaxata—situated on the Araxes, in the plain of Erivan—the ruins of which are still known by the name of Ardashir.

During the civil wars of Rome, and until the advent of Pompeius, Armenia was one of the great powers of the world. Upon the revival of Roman prestige, however, it again sank to its former modest status, though it survived as a kingdom until the fourth century A.D. It was the first political community to introduce Christianity as the religion of the state, an event which occurred during the reign of Tiridates (A.D. 300).

In A.D. 387 Armenia was conquered, the Romans taking the western, and the Sassanid kings of Persia the somewhat greater eastern, portion of the kingdom. The province was held by the Sassanids until their downfall in the seventh century, when, together with all the other Persian provinces, it fell into the hands of the Arabian Caliphs, from whom it was again wrested by the celebrated Armenian dynasty of the Bagratidæ, who emancipated their country from the Arabian yoke and reëstablished the kingdom. It was at this time that an Armenian, Leo III, ascended the imperial throne at Constantinople—indeed, the tenth and eleventh centuries may be said to constitute the heroic age of Armenian history.

But the unity of the kingdom was destroyed at last by incessant conflicts between the nobility; and thus, upon the invasion of the Turks and Mongols, all resistance was rendered nugatory; Cilicia alone maintaining a petty Christo-Armenian kingdom until the close of the fourteenth century. At the time of the Reformation, Armenia was divided between the Turkish and the Persian empires; but in 1829

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Russia seized almost the entire Persian province, including the monastery of Etchmiadzin, at the foot of Mount Ararat, the seat of the Chief Patriarch of the Armenian Church.

As we survey the history of the Armenian people, we are impressed by their extraordinary national and religious power of resistance. Although completely surrounded by the tumultuous waves of Mohammedanism, Armenia has nevertheless succeeded, throughout 1,500 years, in preserving its national and religious integrity. Founded at the time of the first great Ecumenical Conference at Nicæa (A.D. 325), the Armenian National Church, now counting several million followers, has remained intact. In order to do full justice to the nation, therefore, we must contrast this fact with the fate of the other Christian communities in the Orient since the rise of Islam. What has become of the Syrians, of the Egyptians, and of the Christian sects of Asia Minor? In Syria and Egypt, countries that once possessed a far more extensive ecclesiastical establishment than Armenia, the Christian Church and the ancient national tongue have become completely obliterated by Mohammedanism and the Arabian language; while in Asia Minor not a vestige remains to remind one that at the time of the Crusades the region was still the abode of Christian communities.

The intellectual life of Armenia survived until the fourteenth century. Then, under the pressure of Mohammedan rule, it began to stagnate. A condition of intellectual torpor ensued; and Armenia and the Armenians completely disappeared from the horizon of Western Christendom. The old historians and theologians, who, by their splendid works, had created the classical Armenian tongue, were faithfully transcribed in the monasteries, while their ritualistic formulas, and lectures from the Scriptures, were read in that language; but gradually the people ceased to understand them. Turkish and Persian idioms encroached more and more upon the language; until, finally, the contrast between the corrupt popular dialect and the language of the Church and of literature became as pronounced as that existing between the English of to-day and the Anglo-Saxon speech of the time of Alfred the Great. In consequence of this deterioration, the language of the Bible gradually became incomprehensible to the layman. Indeed, even among the priesthood, many were actually unable to understand what they read from the pulpit on Sundays; and this condition, with a scarcely noticeable improvement, has practically remained unchanged to the present day.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Until a few decades ago, the condition of education in Armenia, religious and secular, was not distinguishable from that prevailing in other Oriental countries; and there were few who could boast of an acquaintance with the splendid historic and literary traditions of their people. But three distinct agencies have lately coöperated in effecting an improvement. As early as the beginning of the eighteenth century Petrus Mechitar (*i.e.*, the Comforter) founded the theological congregation known by the name of Mechitarians—a union of Armenian monks aiming at the scientific resuscitation of the National Church. As the work undertaken, however, was entirely without precedent in Armenia, and as the lack of experience was painfully felt (the Greek Church being no better off in this regard than the Armenian), a close union with the Church of Rome was rendered imperative—more particularly as the congregation, expelled from Turkish soil, was compelled to remove its headquarters to foreign territory. Since 1717, the Mechitarians, united with the Church of Rome, have been domiciled in a monastery upon the Isle of San Lazzaro near Venice; and, since 1810, a branch has also been established at Vienna.

The labors of these men in behalf of the Armenian nation have been very considerable, and, notably within our own century, very successful. In 1734, they published for the first time a printed edition of the Armenian Bible; and this was followed by a great mass of works, comprising editions of old Armenian writers as well as original contributions to the history, language, literature, and religion of the country. In course of time, however, the Mechitarians have gradually become estranged from their national church; and to-day, notwithstanding the continuance of scientific and literary activity, the separation between this priesthood, now thoroughly Roman Catholic, and the Gregorian Church is practically complete.[1] Nevertheless, the labors of the Mechitarians still operate as a potent factor in the intellectual life of the whole Armenian people, and constitute an invaluable guide to the study of Armenian antiquity.

The second factor in this intellectual progress was the Russian acquisition of Persian Armenia in 1829, which brought to the new Christian subjects of the Czar such culture as Russia could supply. The Russo-German University of Dorpat, in Livonia, was especially popular with Armenian students, while the splendid Lazarew Insti-

[1] The "Gregorian Church," so called after Gregory the Enlightener, the apostle of Armenia (about A.D. 300).

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tute for Oriental Languages at Moscow (endowed by Armenians for the purpose) furnished excellent opportunities for the study of the Armenian language. It now became fashionable for wealthy Armenians to provide scholarships for talented youths of their own nationality, that these might be enabled to extend their intellectual horizon ; and it became common for these students to aspire beyond the confines of Russian colleges to the more fruitful sources of scientific inquiry in the Occident. As a result of their efforts, the last generation records, upon the one hand, an extensive system of journalism and a new and prolific secular Armenian literature, and, upon the other, the establishment of a great number of public schools, which, like an intricate and ever denser network, are gradually overspreading the entire Russian province.

When we consider the conditions prevailing until the middle of the present century we must confess that these schools have accomplished wonders. In 1850, reading and writing were still rare accomplishments among Armenians ; whereas, among the younger generation in Russia to-day, mastery of the mother-tongue in word and print is the rule. Unfortunately, the Russian Government, several years ago, found it necessary to close all Armenian schools in order to destroy the intellectual independence of the Armenian element, and to promote that process of Russification which has recently been extended also to Finland.

The third factor in the intellectual revolution of Armenia is the influence exercised since 1831 by the American missions in Turkey, the activity of which has ever been fundamental in character. At first the Americans attempted to prosecute the religious propaganda in union with the Armenian Church. Within a few years after the establishment of the missions, however, the high clergy of the Gregorians assumed a decidedly hostile attitude, with the result that the American missionaries at once began to inaugurate a system of proselytism. In this way arose the so-called American Protestant Mission congregations, the combined membership of which, in 1890, aggregated 12,000 adults, with 17,000 children being taught in the schools.

The American posts extend throughout every portion of Anatolia and Armenia, and include even Northern Syria and Mesopotamia. They consist of about 180 central and branch stations, with 117 churches, 5 colleges, 26 high-schools for boys, 18 for girls, and several hundred common schools. The more important American cen-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tres in the interior are Sivas, Kaisariyeh, Charput, Aintab, Marash, Urfa, Bitlis, and Wan. Of these, Charput, near the confluence of the two sources of the Euphrates, and Aintab, upon the southern declivity of the east Cilician Taurus, contain the two principal colleges; all buildings being erected in modern style.

When I recall the hospitality and the variety of information received at the hands of the men and women of the American mission stations during my last trip through Armenia, I become doubly conscious of the responsibility assumed in attempting to criticise the life-work of these noble and pious people. I make this statement in order to remove any possible misconception as to my motives if, in the course of this paper, I venture to criticise certain phases of the American work. Whatever may be said, however, it must be admitted that the influence exerted by America upon the intellectual life of the Armenian nation deserves a very high estimate.

The political and social changes thus promoted have been followed by the conditions embraced in the term "The Armenian Question." In a word, the national consciousness of Armenia having been aroused, the school and the press found rapid and universal extension. Young men from the Turkish as well as from the Russian provinces thronged to obtain an education abroad; and, most important of all, there arose among the millions of Armenians scattered throughout the world a strong sense of national unity. This sentiment found its visible embodiment in the National Church; and so striking is this symbolization with Armenians that converts to other forms of Christianity are by them no longer recognized as compatriots. This explains the impossibility of ever making a successful propaganda in behalf of a foreign creed, and consequently applies to the American mission work, which, apart from its meritorious achievements, has caused a schism in the Armenian body social which will be extremely difficult if not impossible to heal. It is equally true that, in consequence of this intimate relationship between the Armenian and his National Church, the intellectual and religious endowment bestowed by the American missionaries upon their Protestant converts can never become a useful possession of the nation at large.

During the seventh decade of the present century, the contrast between the condition of the Armenians in Russia and those in Turkey was particularly marked, inasmuch as the latter, owing to their remoteness, were completely hidden from the gaze of civilized Europe, and were consequently subjected to greater injustice and oppression

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

than were any other Christian subjects of the Sultan. Particularly atrocious were the acts of violence committed by the Kurds (already referred to as constituting one of the nationalities of Turkish Armenia) against the property, life, and honor of their Armenian neighbors; and these barbarities naturally aroused in the hearts of the Christian population of the country a strong desire to see Russia victorious in a war against the Turkish oppressor. To such a war, if successful, they confidently looked for an amelioration of their condition, for had not Russia for centuries been regarded as the guardian of the Christian communities in the Orient? Moreover, this powerful conviction that the Czar would come to their assistance was designedly encouraged from various quarters of Russia.

The war of 1877–78 was, as we know, attended by only a partial success of the Russian arms. When the conquest of the Turkish armies had finally been achieved—a conquest which entailed an enormous sacrifice of time, money, and men—the resources of Russia were so completely exhausted that she was compelled to submit, when the European Powers, and notably England, at the Congress of Berlin (1878), prevented her from fully reaping the fruits of victory. Russia was compelled to surrender the territory of Armenia, already occupied by the Muscovite forces; the Armenians, on the other hand, receiving a guarantee that the European Powers would secure from Turkey an improvement of their condition. This guarantee is embodied in Article 61, Acts of the Congress of Berlin of 1878, which reads as follows:

"The Sublime Porte assumes the obligation of immediately establishing the necessary improvements and reforms demanded by the local conditions of all provinces inhabited by Armenians, *and guarantees security against the Circassians and Kurds.* The Porte further pledges itself to advise the Powers, at stated intervals, of the reforms introduced; *and the Powers will exercise surveillance as to their proper execution.*"

This document bears the signatures of the European Powers as well as of Turkey. Yet to the Armenians it has not had the value of the paper upon which it is written; and to it we must directly ascribe all the terrible misery that has fallen to their lot within the last few years. The complete disregard of the Armenian complaints cannot be looked upon as nearly so serious an evil as the unkept promise of the European Powers to exercise surveillance over the proper execution of the Turkish reforms.

In 1898 I took an extensive trip through Turkish Armenia as well as through the strongly Armenian provinces of Anatolia and Kurdis-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tan ; and I can assure the reader that no adequate conception can be formed as to the actual conditions in those provinces. Two hundred thousand Armenians have either been murdered or have succumbed to wounds, sickness, and hunger. Over 100,000 children have been robbed of one or both parents, and have been left helpless upon the world. Over 50,000 fugitives have crossed over the Russian and Persian borders, barely escaping with their lives. From the Sea of Wan to the Euphrates, I found but a single village which had not been plundered and devastated by Kurds or Turks. In every other community a large number of the young men had either been murdered or had sought safety in flight, while the women and girls had been kidnapped. These atrocities would never have been perpetrated to such an awful extent had not the European Powers in 1878 bestowed upon the Armenians that baneful gift, Article 61.

Despite the guarantee of the Powers, the question of reforms for Armenia, during the years following upon the Congress of Berlin, was scarcely touched upon by the Turkish Government, which soon became convinced that none of the European nations was interested in pressing the matter beyond an occasional energetic diplomatic protest. Consequently, the Government at Constantinople soon began to instigate a series of vexatious intrigues against the Armenians, using as its agents, first, the provincial representatives of the Government, then the Kurds, and, finally, the Mohammedan population generally ; and these persecutions obtained additional virulence from the fact that the Armenians were known to have had a hand in the war of 1877–78.

Throughout a period of seventeen years (1878–95) these unfortunate conditions, due to Article 61 and various other unfulfilled pledges of the Powers, gradually brought the educated and politically informed classes of the Armenian population to the brink of despair. With fanatical zeal the youth of the land maintained the validity of Article 61, and sought upon every possible occasion to convince the people that they were being defrauded of a sacredly guaranteed right. Said they : "Europe is obliged, before God and man, to redeem its pledge in behalf of our interests against Turkey, either by diplomatic negotiations or by the intervention of arms!" It was to England, particularly, that the people looked for the fulfilment of this moral obligation ; and certainly no other nation ever gave the Armenians greater encouragement to sustain their cause than did England.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Secret societies of every description were now organized for the purpose of preparing the people for the fulfilment of that "sacred duty" which, it was held, the European nations would sooner or later fulfil. These agitators, inspired partly by an honest belief, and partly by the hope of more successfully manipulating the people, eventually went so far as to announce European intervention for the near future. Nay, some of the members of these revolutionary societies proceeded to actual threats, and occasionally to deeds of violence, against the Turks, in order to stir the authorities and the Mohammedan populace to bloody reprisals against the Armenians. They hoped, in this way, to promote difficult complications which would necessitate the armed intervention of Europe, and justified these desperate measures with the words: "It is better that a few should die in sacrifice than that a whole people should decay."

Naturally, nothing could have embittered the Turks more than this constant agitation, which was openly designed to bring about foreign interference on Turkish soil. Apart from this, another circumstance here deserves consideration. During my visit to Anatolia I was told by Turks of irreproachable character—and the matter is no secret to those familiar with the affairs of the Palace at Constantinople—that a number of persons in the *entourage* of the Sultan, in order to curry favor with that ruler, continually picture to him all manner of imaginary dangers, in order that they may pose as the guardians and saviours of his Majesty. These methods were practised with considerable success with regard to the Armenian revolutionists. Frightened at the reports conveyed to him, the Sultan finally decided upon orders of death against the Armenian insurgents; and these orders, with the disturbance and discontent created by the menacing attitude of the Armenians themselves, together with religious fanaticism, lust of gain, and a desire to appease the rebellious Kurds, all conspired to bring about the terrible events of 1895–96.

Even from a Turkish point of view the massacres were regarded as pure insanity. They depopulated and devastated an extensive territory as completely as if a war had swept over it, and contributed to reduce the revenue of whole provinces to a minimum. The actual purpose of rendering the Armenians harmless might easily and expeditiously have been effected by a general and imperative order of disarmament—more particularly, as the majority of the Armenian population were without guns. Selfishness, blind rage, and silly

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

thoughtlessness were here responsible for the heaviest blow sustained by the Turkish Government since the war of 1877.

In addition to England, it is likely that Russia and France would have been inclined to favor intervention. Yet two circumstances coöperated to frustrate these good intentions. In the first place, England, in the event of a serious engagement of France and Russia in the Orient, would at once have utilized her opportunity in other parts of the world for the furtherance of selfish purposes; while Germany, owing to her friendly relations with Turkey, would have been unable to participate. In this regard Germany's policy has been severely condemned from the standpoint of Christianity and humanity; but this harsh criticism is frequently based upon ignorance of the motives governing the action of German statesmen.

Owing to the tremendous increase of her population and the comparative worthlessness of the colonies hitherto acquired, Germany, for very self-preservation, is compelled to secure markets offering raw material in exchange for manufactures; and of these Turkey has now become one of the most important. As an illustration I need here cite but a single instance, viz., the Bagdad railroad, extending from Constantinople to the Persian Gulf. This enterprise, conducted under the supervision of Germans and eventually to be controlled by them, will ultimately secure industrial and commercial employment to hundreds of thousands and perhaps millions of people throughout the German Empire. As an anti-Turkish attitude would have destroyed these prospects, we can readily understand why the German Emperor and his advisers considered it incumbent to place the interests of their own people above those of the Armenians.

What, then, will be the future of the Armenian nation? Although enthusiasts may dream of a future kingdom of Armenia, I believe it probable that, politically speaking, the Armenians, in the event of an ultimate dissolution of Turkey, will, for the greater part, become subjects of the Czar. But a discussion of this political side of the question is not my purpose; and it therefore remains for me to consider only the prospects of the Armenian nation from an ethical point of view.

The European and American benefactors of Armenia have, during the past four or five years, contributed over $3,000,000 to alleviate the suffering of the people; and it may be safely asserted that it was largely the assistance thus offered which enabled the Armenians to tide over the terrible period of poverty and famine immediately following upon the massacres. Nevertheless, of the 100,000 orphans

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that survived the massacres a great number afterward succumbed to privation and want. Some were dragged into Mohammedan houses, while others are still living amid misery and want. Fifty thousand, however, are now safely housed in the orphan asylums built for these children by contributions from Germany, England, America, and elsewhere, and these institutions may be attended with infinite blessing provided education be so conducted that the children, instead of becoming estranged, shall be fitted to work as a leaven among their own people. To this end, two conditions are requisite: (1) the children must not be converted to Protestantism, but must be permitted to remain within their own National Church; and (2) inasmuch as the children will probably pass their lives in the Orient, all branches of secular education must be so conducted as to prepare the graduate for Oriental conditions.

In this connection, I am compelled to assume a somewhat critical attitude toward the practice of my esteemed American friends in Turkey. True, it has now been decided to permit the students to attend the Gregorian Church, while so instructing them at the asylums that they shall nevertheless eventually become Christians in the evangelical sense. But this aim has not been everywhere realized; and I have further observed that certain schools give instruction in branches which, while useful, and perhaps needful, to English and American children, will only tend, in a country like Turkey, to arouse views and sentiments in complete discord with actual conditions. The reader will readily understand why I cannot here be more explicit; and I trust, further, that my words will not occasion doubt as to my sincere conviction that the American mission-institutions, during the past few years, have proved the most important factor in the redemption of the Armenian people.

Finally, we should not forget that within the fold of the National Church itself, and particularly at Etchmiadzin, the seat of the Patriarch, sound reforms have now been successfully instituted, aiming at the vitalization of clerical life and a more thorough scientific training of the ministry. In view of this fact, it devolves upon us as a sacred duty to do our utmost to secure amicable relations between these Gregorian reformers and the evangelical missions from abroad. Above all, we must strive to convince the Armenian clergy that we have no intention of making proselytes, and that we shall be content to leave the religious and national unity of the Armenian people undisturbed.

CARL ALBERT PAUL RÖHRBACH.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE AMERICAN SCHOOL OF SCULPTURE.

HAVE we an American School of Sculpture? That is to say, is there in the sculpture of this country a note peculiar to itself, and of sufficient distinctiveness to justify us in characterizing it as American? To be answered fully and aright, this question needs to be considered with the seriousness due to its importance.

First of all let us briefly define the note that is American in contradistinction to the note that is French, Italian, or Japanese. To do this we must recognize the fact that, in founding their national schools, the greatest artists, of whatever race, produced works that responded to the demands of their age and to the needs of their people. Art falls under the iron law of economy, the law of supply and demand; and the artist who does not respond to the demand of his people and of his time produces insipid abstractions, without vitality, which posterity will ignore. This is not mere theory; it is a fact borne out by history—without exception. But before supply must come the demand. So we find ourselves confronted with the further question: Is there a demand in this country for serious works of art that will typify our growth, our history, and our aspirations, and that will embody our ideals?

The fact that such works of art have been, and are being, produced, and that no important work of art symbolizing the ideals of a race, and recording its historical achievements, comes by chance, is sufficient evidence that the American people desire to perpetuate their traditions and ideals in permanent form. Were it not so, no such works as those I shall mention in this paper would have found a *raison d'être*. Therefore, the growth of national sculpture in America has simply exemplified the working from cause to effect.

Here some one may ask why painting has seemingly made greater strides in this country than sculpture. This is the popular impression, and in degree it may be true, especially in so far as landscape painting is concerned. The reason is not far to seek. Color is with us from our infancy, and even the savage is impressed by its power, whereas pure form appeals only to the cultured mind. Sculpture is

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

essentially symbolic ; it needs a history to furnish it with its ideals, and therefore comes last in the development of the culture of a nation. There must be heroes and heroic themes before there is any *raison d'être* for sculpture ; and naturally a people building highways across a continent, felling forests, bridging rivers, and fighting savages, has no time or thought for art. So it comes that only of late years have our people awakened to the fact that the history of a century has supplied them with facts and ideals so glorious as to demand enduring embodiment in marble and bronze, and to this new and increasing interest in patriotic sculpture are due the birth and growth of our American school.

But it is plain to any thinking man that the artist who desires to put forth work that shall possess this distinctively American note must live in closest touch with his people, must be familiar with their traditions and history, and must not be afraid to represent his themes as they appear to the American eye. It would be as foolish to distinguish as American the work of a foreign sculptor who should come here and carve or paint American themes under the influence of foreign ideals, as it would be to distinguish as French the work of one who, born and bred in America, should exhibit at the Salon a statue of Du Guesclin or of Henry IV. What should be said of a London novelist who, without having seen America, should write a story of Western frontier life, or of a New England village? This age is one which preëminently demands truth in art, whether plastic or literary.

Until the World's Fair, our artists did not know what they were about. Their art was a bizarre mingling of many schools, just as our architecture has been. Here and there, to be sure, there was an isolated man working along the right lines, but there was no distinctively American school.

Briefly speaking, the American school of art is a happy fusion of classical forms—the heritage of the ages—with a peculiarly modern sympathetic note, which may be called humanitarian, and therein is distinctive. Greek art was Olympian, but not human in our sense of the word. I do not claim for American art the monopoly of this human note. French art, or indeed any other modern school of art, may be human as well as classic ; but the difference is this, that the note of sympathy apparent in each school springs from its own especial interpretation of man's relation to man, and derives its character therefrom. Consequently, American art takes its character from our particular conception of the humanities, and this conception can be

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

possessed only by the artist, who, by living and working on his native soil, among his own people, is enabled instinctively to feel the mental, moral, and physical pulse.

Now there are many Americans to-day who are accomplishing work that is undoubtedly brilliant, but is in no sense American or related to the time. Living as they do for the most part abroad, these men are so much under the influence of their foreign masters, that their work, however clever it may appear, is but an echo of their masters' work, and lacks the spontaneity and impulse which distinguish original thought. These men, to say the least, are guilty of the sin of omission as well as of commission. Nature has bestowed upon them an artistic gift, which they have not the virility and hardiness to cultivate as becomes true Americans and patriots. In the show and shimmer of foreign capitals they dissipate powers that ought to be dedicated to their race and land as men dedicate their lives in battle. In part this is due to their misconception of a national art—in part to blindness to the import of its deeper meanings, and to a misunderstanding of what cosmopolitan art really is. They forget that true cosmopolitan art is the result of an intense and fervent patriotism. Coleridge, who thought deeply along these lines, affirms that patriotism is the fountainhead of all genuine cosmopolitanism ; but these men are not patriotic enough to make the sacrifices that American art demands of her true artist-sons—such sacrifices as Michelangelo gloried in when he said, "I go my way alone." They prefer to dwell abroad in what they call an atmosphere of art, rather than to labor to create such an atmosphere in their own country. They add nothing to the art of the countries in which they live, for their works are neither of this soil nor that, but are creations which hang between heaven and earth. As a great French artist once remarked to the writer, " Do these men dream that they can teach us anything on our own soil? "

Whence springs this fault? Largely from the tactics of our critics and our educators. They have dinned into our ears the thought that after Greece came the deluge, so far as creative work was concerned —as if the last note in art had been uttered with the passing of Phidias and Praxiteles, as if the human heart were never to have a fresh emotion, and man was to love, hate, and grieve no more. They have forgotten that art is absolute truth, and never changes ; that it is man's view that widens and expands with culture, or is obscured by the refusal of knowledge ; and that foreign lands can give us no

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

source of inspiration that we have not at home. They have ignored the existence of tremendous educative powers in our own land, and have lost sight of the fact that in art the first duty of every nation is to be itself, to assert its own tastes and develop its own ideals, and to put forth all that is most personal, genuine, and most characteristic of the race. They have been blind to the truth that the world will always listen to these solemn confessions of the national soul, to these picturings of the soil, customs, needs, history, aspirations—in fact, of the public and personal life of a people.

But despite all the hindrances of unsympathetic criticism, and despite the dicta of men who, with all their book knowledge of art, do not understand what the present generation of sculptors in America is striving to accomplish, we are making constant progress in the formation of a great National School of Sculpture.

Now as to evidence of the claim that an American School of Sculpture exists. The fact that Americans have won distinction in all the great foreign exhibitions—at Paris, London, Berlin, and Rome—is no proof of the existence of a distinctively American School. Medals are given in foreign exhibitions largely for technical cleverness, achievement, and only in rare instances for supremely idealistic work. It is the facility of the hand rather than that of the brain that is rewarded. That happy fusion where hand, brain, and heart work in the harmony which finds its result in an art work that may be called great, can be found only in the land which gives birth to the artist—his native land. This is evidenced in all countries. Witness, in England, the failure of so great a man as Boehm, who, though an Englishman by long residence, failed to leave any lasting impression upon the Victorian age. So with Hiram Powers, and all that coterie of American sculptors who made their homes in Italy. It is hard to find in the records of American art any result of their labors.

It has remained for the sculptors of the present generation to produce a distinctively American School of Sculpture. Even were there no more than one example, the affirmation I have made could be sustained from the prospective view. But, fortunately, we can name a few eminent men and examples of their work. We have St. Gaudens, with his Farragut statue, and his Shaw Memorial (at Boston); Olin Warner, with his beautiful Fountain in Oregon, and his ideal portrait of Maud Morgan, the harpist; Daniel C. French, with his mystic Death and the Sculptor, perhaps the greatest of his works; J. Q. A. Ward, with his statue of Washington, on the Treasury steps, and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

his ideal conception of an Indian Hunter, in Central Park. In the younger generation we can mention a score of names that are carrying on the work which these inaugurated; but the three or four names I have given are enough to demonstrate the fact that there exists to-day, in our land, a School of Sculpture that is for and of America. If it can be demonstrated by one successful crop that wheat will grow in a certain northern latitude, it is fair to assume that successive crops can be garnered from the same soil. But just as wheat is grown by formula and not by caprice, so the School of Sculpture which these men have founded will grow and develop in the measure in which we give our intelligence, our love, and our feelings to that art.

While affirming the existence of that dominant note which, to make it racial, must characterize any school of to-day, I refrain from measuring at present the extent of its influence in America. I would sooner inquire how we may strengthen that note and nourish that influence. To this the broad answer is, of course, the development of patriotism, that is, of civic and national pride. In a great measure patriotism is the result of education—that is, of course, a patriotism which is anything beyond that innate love of soil which is said to beget that curious malady called *Heimweh*—and patriotism in art is that knowledge of, and pride in, the history, traditions, and life of a people which impels the artist to study and picture them.

But how are we to conserve and nourish this precious art heritage which the great names cited are handing to us? By realizing, I think, what the American people owe to their sculptors, and what sculptors owe to them. What does the sculptor demand from his fellows by way of aid in his mission? He demands they should draw out wisely and with discretion this artistic inclination and precious instinct, and that they should encourage it not only by the generous endowment of scholarships, but by personal sympathy whenever and wherever such genius comes to their notice; for only by such discernment and sympathy can great art be nourished for the people.

And what do the American people demand of the sculptor? First, that he shall be sincere; for, to be great, art must be wholly sincere. The moment the artist stops to ask himself how the world will receive his creations, that very moment he is condemning his work to certain oblivion. He is reading his own death-warrant. The creation must be wrapped up in, and produced spontaneously from, the man's interior purpose. He must press on fearlessly, giving his purposes full and complete control. The moment he dabbles in pub-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lic opinions, that moment his purpose staggers, the harmony of his thought is broken, and no matter how much immediate praise may gather about him, his work will scarcely outlive the hand that executes it, unless it lives as a negative example.

Second, that he shall possess that fine reverence and love for the traditions and history of his people which will enable him to embody in a simple and dignified form the ideals of his race; for, as Whitman says, "The art of art, the glory of expression, is Simplicity."

Third, that he shall be definite and definitive, which is another way of saying that the art impulse must be present with him and under the control of his intellect. This implies genius, culture, and sincerity.

It is a popular fallacy that knowing how to model makes the sculptor. Technique is mechanical, and apart from the vital, germinating force which stands for genius in art. Genius is a capacity above all this. Unless the sculptor feels something stirring within himself, more powerful than the forces he sees about him in physical nature, he had better let this art alone. The tempest carries a world of noise and fury over the forests, but they produce no music—they have not the sense of harmony. There are music, color, and form in everything about us; but it is only the man who feels the music in his own soul who can command the music of inanimate objects. This is the artist's gift, and his production will always be less than the music he hears, than the picture he sees, and than the statue he rounds out in his interior life. It is implied, of course, that the hand and eye must be trained thoroughly. All the intense, passionate fervor of an Angelo would be of little avail if the hand were unable to carry out the mind's behest. The eye of sense must give natural and symmetrical proportion to the forms seen by the intellect and the imagination.

One word as to the sculptor who, born and bred in this land, goes abroad for study. He should have his character well rounded out; his individuality should have reached a point where it may stand alone. He should know what the name America stands for, and what her institutions mean. He should have learned something of the forces and events which have gone to make up this mighty republic. And, back of all this, he should know the history of other republics, and the causes of their rise and disintegration. Finally, he must be master of himself; otherwise he will soon be confused and led astray by the jargon of the schools and by the flippant, dissipated life which is in vogue abroad. In one word, he must be educated, not merely

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

trained. Why was Athens great? Because she educated her sons; the men were not merely trained, as we train children to-day in our public schools, but they were educated, which means something more. It means the rounding out of the mind, not filling its different crannies with facts and statistics, which enable men to compete with other men in the struggle for existence. Tyre and Sidon bought and sold; their commercial activity was known to the ends of the civilized world; and yet for us to-day they are mere names—so much sound which lives a moment on the lips, and then is a part of the air we have expired. Athens educated; and therefore her light shines more brightly to-day than it did 500 years before Christ, and her influence is vaster than it was in the age of Pericles. Let us, therefore, grasp the importance of educating, not merely training our art students. The artist may foreshadow and point the best way of doing this—but the doing of it rests with the people.

But in our art there are dangers which are very ominous. Often one is led to question whether the sculptor, architect, or painter is following his calling for the love and glory of it, or merely for the material gain. Our artists, as well as others, are in danger of the death-dealing influence of luxury, which expresses itself in their works as well as in their lives, and is particularly noticeable in the tendency to overload buildings with decorative carvings that have no special meaning. The perils and shortcomings of our art, and for that matter of our age, spring from our failure to rise to the power, dignity, and demands of true manhood. Art must reflect the man behind it. The art of any age is the index to the controlling thoughts and the dominant feelings of that age; and there can be no great art without a correspondingly great manhood. It was Thermopylæ which made Phidias; and Michelangelo and the masters of the Renaissance were, first of all, great men, who lived truly and did not dally with empty forms or concern themselves with dress suits and dinners. When Greece, after the age of Pericles, began to think more of show and of result than of the desire to produce men, she deteriorated at once; losing not only the power to produce great men, but the capability to appreciate the results that had been attained by them. If we demand in our artists first of all a high order of manhood, if we cherish higher ideals and seek a simple and genuine life, we shall rise to heights in art that shall rival Greece and Florence.

Let me say a further word as to the duty of the American republic toward the American School of Sculpture. In art, as in every other

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

phase of national life, each man owes something to his country. What the country asks and has a right to demand of every man is his contribution. We have founded our school and are standing at the cross roads. Some men about us give their money, some men give criticism, and some give nothing, but are forever in debt to the world. Yet neither money nor advice will totally relieve this indebtedness. Each one must give his moral quota, or something will be lacking in the balance. Truly great men give the highest they have, which is themselves. So, on the other hand, must an artist contribute to the world's art his very self, or be forever in debt to it; for he is worth, in the actual balance, only the moral count of that self or soul. That is all he can give.

Who are these men who say we have no history? Surely they have spent their time in reading the literature of other countries. Who are these men who say that our background is not picturesque? It is more than picturesque; it is tragically beautiful. Does the human heart change? Are not its loves and passions the same as those which animated the hearts of the Egyptians who antedated the Pyramids? The heart is the same, but the problem of life is presented to it in a different way, and on a higher scale; and our art must likewise be presented on a different and higher plane. It is the manner in which we reflect the problems of our life which determines our positions as artists and the character of the art we produce.

One word in conclusion. The art of sculpture, more than all others, has contributed to the highest enjoyment and calm intellectual satisfaction of the peoples among whom it has flourished. No art has so completely realized the human aspiration for absolute and calm beauty, and the benign and noble embodiment of man's ideals. Poets have builded their most exalted images upon it; and from its beauty they have drawn their most inspired lines. It stands forever as an assertion of spiritual verity, and its power to ennoble, dignify, and exalt is unbounded. It is the central and most complete development in art that human life has assumed, and no one has ever dared to attribute to it an impure or unworthy object. Wherever carving has had an ignoble office, it has thereby placed itself without the domain of the sculpturesque; and such effort cannot legitimately be termed sculpture, which is more than the poet's song, is the calmest and simplest of all arts, and at once the most moderate and exalted.

WILLIAM ORDWAY PARTRIDGE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SOUTHERN LITERATURE OF THE YEAR.

THE literary productivity of the South in the last few decades is one of the most striking and interesting facts in the mental history of our nation. The pathetic resolutions, not uncommon before the war, that the South should have a literature; the Herculean efforts of Simms to produce one single-handed; the graceful, but rather inconsequent, efforts of his fellows, excepting, of course, that sport of nature, the strange, meteoric genius of Poe—all these had been of small avail. The war came and found the South with little in the way of books save that "literature suited to desolate islands" of which Lowell speaks.

It is hardly more difficult to read the novels of Simms to-day than to imagine that any one ever read them. It needed the war to emancipate Southern genius. That war not only gave the South a subject, but, by the attrition of the sections during the struggle, made that subject familiar and interesting to all. Many highly educated persons had witnessed events that were cardinal in the nation's history, and society was passing even then through the evolution of racial problems which in their entirety were momentous, and in their details infinitely pathetic, tragic, or grotesque. The tenderly nurtured men and women of the South could look back on a social system clouded by disaster, but radiant in the afterglow of tender memories, and the pressure of circumstances made a pen and an inkstand seem a sort of Aladdin's lamp to hundreds.

Under such conditions a literature was sure to arise; in the main it was sure to be dominated by imagination, and in its first generation was likely to be largely the work of women, as, indeed, it is still. But of recent years there has been a change. Literature has widened its scope in the South, both geographically and in the subjects of which it treats. Of course, fiction is still in the lead, and in the *genre* of fiction, as we shall see presently, the old type, the negro story of one kind or another, is still dominant. But the time has passed when Southern literature can be held to comprehend nothing more. Work is being done in the South to-day in almost every field of literature—

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

not, indeed, great work, but worthy work, and it is worth while to call attention to it at the outset of this study of Southern literary activity, even though the work itself is as yet in the bud.

In the field of lyric poetry, for instance, Kentucky has a school that is quite unique, with Mr. Rule, Mr. Fox, Mr. Wilson, and Mr. Cawein as its chief lyrists. In Tennessee Mr. Guthrie and Mr. B. F. Boyle are writing creditable verse; and the poetry of Mr. Rose, of Arkansas, has a polish that suggests some subtle connection between cypress groves and the classics. In Alabama Dr. Dudley Powers and Miss Horace Weedon have written very characteristic negro verse; and in North Carolina Prof. Sledd is publishing creditable poetry of a more conventional type. As I write there comes to my desk a striking volume by Prof. Trent, of Tennessee, and doubtless there are many who would agree with Cicero in the Latin reader, and prefer the verses that I have omitted to those that it has occurred to me to mention; for the Southern poet-grove is full of little songsters, and there is no clearly dominant note among them.

In drama the only name that occurs to me for the moment is that of Mr. Rose, who has distinguished himself also in criticism, a subject on which Mr. Trent's volume of essays has been one of the noteworthy books of the year. In history useful work is being done in Louisiana by Miss King, by Mr. Bugby in Texas, and by Mr. Fairbanks in Florida. Indeed, in history the interest seems to be growing more rapidly than in any other field of literary activity. It shows itself in legislatures, as, for instance, in the creation of the Alabama Manuscript Commission. It shows itself, too, in the recent undertaking by a Richmond publisher of a coöperative history of the United States, of whose many volumes eight are to be written in the South, by men of university training. And if we were to look through Southern college catalogues, we should find that the attention given to the systematic study of history is perhaps proportionately greater than in the North. Then, too, the South is bestirring itself pedagogically. Series of text-books for primary and grammar school are being projected by her publishers; and the names of her professors are often seen in the lists of Northern publishing houses.

Almost as striking as the variety of this literary effort is its diffusion. There is hardly a State whose mention does not recall to us some name deserving at least a passing mention. Mr. Page has found a worthy Virginian compeer in Miss Glasgow, whose "Voice of the People" reaffirms the talent shown in her "Phases of an Inferior

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Planet" by its picture of a Virginia country town in Reconstruction times, with the old aristocracy for its background and a "poor white" for its hero—another handling of the perennially attractive upheaval of the social structure which followed the Civil War. The students of the University of Virginia, too, are bearing their share in the development of Southern fiction, as is witnessed by "Idylls of the Lawn," just fresh from the press, six stories of quite original flavor and individual promise, and Florence Hull Winterburn has lately paid another tribute to the literature of Virginia in "Southern Hearts."

In North Carolina Prof. Sledd represents literature by his poetry and fiction, and passing softly over South Carolina, we find Georgia illuminated by the talent of Mr. Edwards and Mr. Harris. Alabama may claim Dr. Powers and Miss Weedon, and has recently added to her literary citizenship that most talented of the young aspirants to literary fame, the author of "To Have and to Hold." In Louisiana Mr. Cable shares New Orleans with Miss Dunbar and Mrs. Davis, and divides the State with Mrs. Stuart and Miss King. From Arkansas come the charming tales of Octave Thanet as well as the verses and essays of Mr. Rose. Missouri contributes as her quota the fiction of Mr. Baskett; and Tennessee, in addition to the poets and critics that we have mentioned, claims Sarah Barnwell Elliott, Charles Egbert Craddock, and, at least by adoption, the author of "The De Willoughby Claim," Frances Hodgson Burnett. Beside the names already mentioned Kentucky places Mr. Robertson, and also Mr. Allen, who has, indeed, been silent during the year, and as I write a new author, Mr. John Uri Lloyd, is giving good promise in his "Stringtown on the Pike." Maryland rounds out the circle with Mr. Stimpson, Mrs. Whitelock, and Mr. Hopkinson Smith, who, cosmopolitan as he is, has contributed during the year to what is distinctively the literature of the South. And there is Southern literature in the North, too. One need only recall the names of Paul Laurence Dunbar, of Dayton, and of Mr. Charles Chestnutt, of Cincinnati.

Such a list of names as this is merely suggestive of the widespread literary fermentation which shows itself in journalism and in college life, and, indeed, wherever it has the opportunity. It counts very little work of the first rank, but it contains so much of the second as to be full of promise when one considers the difficulty with which literature has had to contend in these Southern States, where it was necessary not merely to create a reading public, but to some extent even a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

public that could read, and where there were few bookstores and fewer libraries.

To get a satisfactory idea of this activity within the scope of an article, we must restrict our attention to a single field and to a brief period. Let us see, therefore, what the South has done in twelve months from May, 1899, to May, 1900, in fiction alone. I have made no minute search, and I claim no bibliographical completeness. But during this year there has come to my notice the work of twenty-four Southern writers of novels and short stories. Of the twenty-four, fourteen are women, which will account perhaps for the fact that there are but four full-grown novels in the group, the others being stories, long or short, though many of them fill a volume.

Taken as a whole, the work of the women must be pronounced to be as artistic, as strong, as effective, and as bold in its dealing with the social problems that vex the South as is that of the men. Perhaps no one in the past year has given us a character quite so complete as Mr. Harris's Minervy Ann of the "Chronicles" and "Plantation Pageants," though Mrs. Burnett, with her Tom De Willoughby, Mornin', and Mat is surely not far behind. On the other hand, no one has treated the psychology of lynching as effectively as Miss Elliott, and no one has seen quite so deep into the racial feeling of the negro as Miss Pemberton, in her tragic story of "Stephen the Black," though Mr. Chestnutt, in "The Wife of His Youth," easily takes the mastery in stating, if not solving, the puzzling questions that gather around the status of the mulatto.

All the characters that I have mentioned, save one, are of negro blood. The African is still, and not unnaturally, the chief source of local color. But one notices that there is a broadening in the field of Southern fiction as well as a deepening in intensity in the handling of its greatest problem. The "poor white," Cracker or mountaineer, is the subject of three of the best stories of the year—by Miss Glasgow, Mr. Robertson, and Mr. Edwards; and he plays a considerable part in Mrs. Burnett's work. Though he fills proportionately less space in Southern fiction than in the halcyon days of Charles Egbert Craddock, he is treated with more power and more discrimination. Creole life, too, no longer finds in Mr. Cable its sole privileged expositor. And beside this variety in the treatment of old themes, we have new ones in Mr. Robertson's fearless handling of the taint in Southern political life, and in Mrs. Whitelock's ingenious study in comparative provincialism, when "Hindsight met Provincialatis."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Of more significance perhaps is the fact that the South is beginning to supply herself with some very genially written books for her children. She is learning to turn her eyes more and more from secession and reconstruction to the romance of her colonial history, and of the Revolution, in which she bore such an honored part that a Northern story-teller, Miss Jeanie Gould Lincoln, has poached on this Southern preserve for her charming "Pretty Tory," a tale of South Carolina in the days of Tarleton. This is but fair exchange, for has not Mr. Thomas Nelson Page elected this year to turn from his delightful delineations of negro character to give us a little story that is not about the South at all, but about "Santa Claus' Partner" in New York?

This emancipation from the persistent spectres of impoverished magnanimity and negro wit and loyalty is refreshing. Realism like Miss Elliott's is tonic; humor like Mr. Harris's is precious; but we are not unwilling to leave them both to walk with Miss Johnston in her golden land of chivalry and romance, to dance with Mr. Stimpson's Tory maid, or to rejoice in the broad-shouldered humanity of Tom De Willoughby. And with this hero of the longest, if not the chief, Southern novel of the year, my retrospect of its fiction shall begin.

No Southern book of the year was greeted by the critics with such unstinted applause as Mrs. Burnett's "In Connection with the De Willoughby Claim"; and one gladly grants that there are points in which it deserves preëminence. It contains more strikingly individualized characters than any other single story of the year, and individual episodes are handled with much skill. There is genuine humor, and there are touches of real pathos. On the other hand, there are passages that recall nothing so much as a Bowery melodrama, say, "Knobs of Tennessee," for instance. The Northern clergyman, Baird, is a criminal fool of passion who must be pronounced a very degenerate descendant of the melancholy hero of "The Scarlet Letter"; Latimer, his would-be confidant, and the little villain Stamps have about the reality of a Thanksgiving Night vision; and Felicia, Rupert, and Margery are shadowy as a Midsummer Night's Dream. But these are mere counters in the game, and there are more of the ilk. The book is redeemed, and is given the promise of long life, by its hero, Tom De Willoughby, who stands out, in his whole-hearted manhood, an example of the sheer force of original creation.

The worst thing about the book is its structure—unless it be its

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

title. The novel consists of, or rather contains—for it is precisely the lack of consistency that I deplore—a Northern melodrama, which is overdrawn and commonplace, and a Southern idyll, which in many parts is exquisite. These two are served in alternate slices, producing somewhat the effect of a layer-cake of lady-fingers and gorgonzola. Neither of them is essentially connected with the De Willoughby Claim, which serves only to float the heroine out of the book on a golden tide, and to form an excuse of reuniting the drama to the idyll after the first chapter had happily divorced them. I recall no novel of the year in which the faults of construction are more glaring or more irritating than in this story from the practised hand of Mrs. Burnett.

The second important Southern novel of the year is Miss Johnston's "To Have and to Hold," which, indeed, might well be placed first, if story-telling were preferred to the drawing of character, and romantic interest to attempted realism. In power to capture and to hold interest American fiction to-day knows no spells more powerful than those of the author of the "Prisoners of Hope." In the firm drawing of character there are several more skilled or favored by nature, and we should be a little skeptical of historical local color of whose vividness we may indeed be sure, but of whose truth we can possess no touchstone. One may see the village grocery and the Washington claimants of Tom De Willoughby to-day; but neither the palpitating heat nor the broad river perspectives of a Virginia landscape will make the "ladyhood" of Patricia or of Jocelyn Leigh, or the Virginian chivalry of Ralph Percy and of John Rolfe, other than a work of fancy. This means that, to endure, the historical novel demands more supreme excellence than the novel of present conditions. Every generation may write romantically of every other, but only our own generation can write realistically of ourselves.

An author's second book is critical. The third is cardinal. Miss Johnston served no labored apprenticeship. She sprang to eminence, if not preëminence, in our historical fiction, in her "Prisoners of Hope," and she has maintained her place in "To Have and to Hold." But the book is a renewal, a retouching of an old picture, a variation of an old theme. Jocelyn is a more brilliant Patricia with a happier fate, success having apparently made the author more kindly disposed to the creatures of her fancy, and to the great public that is so closely wedded to the "lived happy ever after" style of ending. Will she go on producing variants of this admirable heroine, or is she

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to people for us a romantic world? Her third novel will answer that question, and it is the cardinal one for the novelist. Meantime, we are grateful for delicate feeling and tense fabulation combined with the deftest possible handling of a difficult situation, which trembles on that verge over which Ohnet stumbled in "The Iron Master."

The characters in "To Have and to Hold" are set before us after the manner of an impressionist painter—with bold use of brush and palette knife. They are bundles of qualities rather than complete personalities. Especially is this true of the villains, Carnal and the Italian, and of Parson Sparrow, but it is true in a measure of the hero and heroine, and is perhaps the strongest trace of the inexperience of life which we find in this gifted writer. Another fault is that her imagination falls, as the French would say, on the side to which it inclines. Its exuberance would be better for restraint. The pirate episode in several passages more than executes its constant threat to pass from the romantic to the farcical. But, after we have made all the reserves that we will, Miss Johnston is easily first in promise, if not first in performance, of the Southern novelists of the year.

Two other historical novels claim something more than passing mention. Very good in its modest way is Mr. H. B. Stimpson's story of revolutionary Maryland, "The Tory Maid," which from beginning to end gives one the impression of a composite of family traditions, excellently fused and told with more art than we are wont to find in a first flight in fiction. This story has a curious analogue, both in title and in the main situation, in Miss Lincoln's "Pretty Tory," and it is curious to note that the books appeared within a month of one another.

It is difficult to do justice in a paragraph to the simple strength of Pauline Carrington Bouvé's "Their Shadows Before," a story of the Southampton County insurrection of the Virginia negroes, in 1831, combined with a very pretty idyll of girlish love and instinctive unsophisticated righteousness. The strength of the little book lies in the delineation of the motives, half social, half religious, of the negro, Nat Turner, a forerunner of John Brown, at a time when the Abolition agitation had hardly begun in the North, and was felt in the South to be more outrage than menace. The wild, superstitious devotion and self-sacrifice of the protagonist in the tragedy are painted with such restrained power that the future work of the author will be awaited with much interest.

Even more striking as an original contribution to negro psychol-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ogy is Caroline H. Pemberton's "Stephen the Black." She, too, treats the negro not as a vehicle for pathos or humor, but as a subject of psychic study in the relations that arise from the mingling of races. The central figure, Stephen, is a school teacher. Bent on the elevation of his race, he is drawn to the best that he sees in it. He loves an octoroon girl and marries her, by force of will, though in form only, in order to save her from the dangerous charm of a cultured white lover. The latter's love for the octoroon leads him to seek to save Stephen from one of those lynchings on general principles that even recent history shows are not impossible. The girl dies a martyr to her instinct of purity and of race, and the reader is left fascinated, stirred, and yet appalled by the complexity of the strife between ingrained emotion, Christian feeling, and social reason, which the humble tragedy presents. Place must be given also to Mrs. Davis's "The Queen's Garden," less for any strength or originality in its fabulation than for the skill with which the heavy tropical atmosphere of this garden in fever-stricken New Orleans is maintained throughout, recalling in its small way the remarkable effects attained by Zola in "Abbé Mouret's Fault."

These four novels all have the prevailing brevity of Southern fiction, and briefer still is Mr. Harrison Robertson's "If I was a Man." This is a story of politics and love by a journalist who has known how to set off high ideals against the somewhat sordid realities of political practice. Recent events have given this story of intrigue and strife over a Kentucky senatorship a certain actuality ; and in its small way it is a contribution of grave interest. Its promise is more than redeemed by Mr. Robertson's latest story, "Red Blood and Blue," which pulses with a resourceful force that is one of the best traits of our American life.

The last in time among these longer works of fiction is Miss Glasgow's "The Voice of the People," a good novel though not a great one. A writer of such talent should not be content with work that does indeed catch and reflect admirably what lies on the surface, the much abused "local color," but fails to lay firm hold on the deeper verities of human character. The interest of the book is often great, but it is not sustained. It contains many passages of admirable insight. It contains also several very unpleasant "audacities" for the removal of which it would be much the better and none the weaker. It is valuable rather for its great promise than for its achievement.

Something between the novel and the character sketch or short

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

story stands Joel Chandler Harris's "The Chronicles of Minervy Ann," on the whole the most delightfully humorous of the Southern books of the year. The "Chronicles" narrate a series of episodes in the life of this energetic and estimable, not to say inestimable, house servant in the years just following the war, so that we see here in the vigor of middle age what can be observed now only in its decline. No negro in fiction since Uncle Remus has seemed to me quite so real, so quaintly individual yet so typical, so shrewdly witty yet so kind-hearted, so whimsically loyal, so honest, and so true. Minervy tells her own story, swaying as softly as a pendulum from humor to pathos, and it is hard to say which is the more dramatically rendered. In the latter vein it might be difficult to match "How Aunt Minervy Ann Ran Away and Ran Back Again" or "The Case of Mary Ellen." In the former, "How She Joined the Georgia Legislature" and "How She Frailed Out the Gossett Boys" will remain a joy in memory to all who have humor in their souls and a sympathetic knowledge of negro nature. She seems a creation too rare and genuine to lose from our literature. For me, as for Major Purdue, Minervy "has come to stay."

Minervy Ann reappears in Mr. Harris's second book of the year, "Plantation Pageants," which is, however, more in the vein of Uncle Remus than of the Chronicles. The crow, the coon, and the rabbit have their say, and Aunt Minervy makes as excellent an interpreter of this curious animal folklore as did Uncle Remus, reconciling us even to the untimely destruction of Brer Fox in the unctuous satisfaction of Brer Wolf, who in his peaceful digestion "feels too good" to devour poor innocent Brer Rabbit. For the rest, the "Plantation Pageants" is, as the author says, but "a patchwork of memories and fancies," too inconsequent to be enjoyed by grown folks, and hardly likely to be intelligible to children, though Mr. Harris's hand has lost none of its cunning, and the picture of plantation life in old Georgia may help many a busy man to renew his youth in this nursery of fancy.

While I am speaking of children's books, I must not fail to mention, though but in passing, Miss Louise Carnahan's Southern story for boys and girls, "Little Doctor Victoria." Miss Carnahan is a Virginian, though she has figured for some time among writers on the Pacific coast; and this story embalms early memories in the simple, gracious, innocent fashion that marks the "really truly" story-teller of childhood. Another story of Southern girlhood within our

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

year is Miss Amy Blanchard's "Sweet Little Maid." This book possesses in Bubbles a modern Topsy almost worthy to stand beside Mrs. Stowe's creation, and as true to Southern child life as the Drusilla of Mr. Harris's "Pageants."

Turning now to collections of short stories, we catch a new phrasing of the old negro theme in Mr. Charles W. Chestnutt's "The Wife of His Youth." This new element is due to a delicate irony that would jar in such a subject if the writer were not himself of the Blue Veins whose foibles amuse the man who has had all a successful lawyer's opportunity for the study of human nature. His theme in all the stories is the result of racial mingling. Occasionally, as in "The Sheriff's Children" and "The Web of Circumstance," the treatment is tragic. In "Cicely's Dream and the Bouquet" it is pathetic, while in "A Matter of Principle," "Her Virginia Mammy," and "The Wife of His Youth" irony is the main characteristic. All these stories are strong; but the last three claim special attention. How the racial situation in America might strike a man of mixed blood, but of keen intellect and broad mind, has been a curious question to many, and Mr. Chestnutt has answered it interestingly.

In the fiction of Creole Louisiana, Mr. Cable still asserts his supremacy in "Strong Hearts," though Miss Dunbar, with her "Goodness of St. Roque," is not far behind. The three stories that make up Mr. Cable's volume are all wrought with exquisite care. In "The Solitary" there is a Southern intensity of passion that would have gladdened the heart of Stendhal, if he had one. The note in "The Taxidermist" is more subdued, and the effect even more delicately penetrating, while lambent flashes of humor lighten the whole and make it truly delightful. Seldom has Mr. Cable written so winningly as of this bird-stuffer's affection for his art. In the last of his stories, "The Entomologist," Mr. Cable seems to me to err by over-elaboration. He brings us into an atmosphere of mental, moral, and physical morbidity, which would be quite oppressive did not Senda, with her commonplace moral instincts and bread-and-butter morality, conveyed in delightfully quaint German English, open the windows to let in the vitalizing air. In this last work, as in those that have gone before, Mr. Cable pleads for an ideal morality, a blending of religion and poetry, which seem to him to be the necessary complement of each other. He has pleaded the cause at greater length, but seldom if ever more persuasively than in this, which it is to be hoped will represent the crown, and not the swan-song, of his achievement.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

His compeer in the fiction of Creole Louisiana is Alice Dunbar. The fourteen sketches that make up her "Goodness of St. Roque" are for the most part like Mr. Cable's work, but in a minor key. However, they are told more daintily, and with deft touches in local color that befit the slighter and more delicate feminine hand. Another phase of Louisiana life is given us in the tales of Ruth McEnery Stuart, who, in "Holly and Pizen," though she touches no new notes, maintains her place as the best portrayer of Gulf plantation life, which, both in dialect and in mode of thought, differs considerably from that of the cotton States of the Atlantic seaboard, and still more from that of the chosen scenes of Mr. Page's and Miss Murfree's fancy. The two tales that deal with African New York have not the distinction nor the interest that mark the hocus-pocus of the plantation-healer, Uncle 'Riah, whose "holly and pizen" give the volume its name. Hardly less characteristic of Mrs. Stuart at her best is the Indian summer of Miss Melissa's love in "A Note of Scarlet," which strikes the key of Southern puritanism—which is altogether a different thing from the stern New England article, as described by Miss Wilkins.

Less sympathetic, but stronger in its hold on life, is the genius in Sarah Barnwell Elliott's stories of Tennessee and Georgia. Her powers seem to expand with each new volume. Her keen, incisive style, full of subtle suggestion, always sombre and sometimes fierce, will bear at times the comparison with Maupassant that is invited by her maturest work, such as "An Incident" and "Without the Courts." Of all the women of the South who are writing short stories to-day, she seems, measuring her past by her present performance, to promise most; though in her latest volume the critic will readily distinguish some rechauffés of earlier work that mar the general effect and disturb one's judgment. In sharp distinction from her fellows, Miss Elliott chooses to appeal to reason rather than to emotion. Humor there is, but it is apt to be caustic, or even bitter, and it is not spontaneous. She keeps her sentiment for her characters, and the reader is not captured by it. She is very sparing of pathos, desirous always that you shall understand rather than sympathize. It is pleasant, and significant of a tendency to which attention was drawn at the outset, that her last volume deals, as "Jerry" and "The Durkett Spirit" did not, with people whom in the main we should like to know. The negro is inconspicuous; we are emancipated from the reign of the Cracker; and dialect is held in an abeyance that is as refreshing as it

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is artistic. Miss Elliott's work will repay careful watching, for she has not yet given us the full measure of her unique powers.

If the strongest Southern short story of the year be not Miss Elliott's "An Incident," it is Mr. Edwards's "His Defence," a sketch of the "poor white" who has been neglected almost as much in fiction as in our philanthropy and our politics. But this story is in no way characteristic of the volume to which it gives its name. The dominant note is African humor, sometimes playful and sometimes farcical, as in the delicious debate between the negro elder and the "school darkey" on "Pen and Powder." The humor bubbles spontaneously; nowhere is there a sense of effort; but one would gladly exchange all this excellent fooling for a few such touches as the interview between Major Worthington and the Northern General, or for one more such piece of breathing life as Hiram's "Defence."

Last in this brief retrospect shall stand Mrs. Whitelock's "Hindsight and Provincialatis," because it is, if I am right, the first noteworthy effort to bring the cultures of South and North into effective contrast, and to illustrate one by the other. The latter part of the book does not concern me here. The earlier is full of keen judgments and kindly discriminations of what is best in an aristocracy that did not "care intuitively for material things." Provincialatis brings before me on a score of pages another little Southern university town that I have loved. The book is not great, but it is very winning.

Perhaps these last words will be the general verdict on the fiction that has passed before us in this brief review. I see no writer of the first rank either among those who have spoken or among those who have been silent during the year; but I do see a welling up of literary imagination in more varied forms than elsewhere in America. Its characteristic is not cleverness so much as a charm and a grace in which we shall learn to take increasing delight.

BENJAMIN W. WELLS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED